

masha. oi SD m,

Igor SHUMEYKO

SECOND WORLD RELOAD

Moscow

BBK 66.3(2Ros)b

96

1\$VM 15V#

Sh96

The author expresses his gratitude for the assistance in the preparation of this book to the Heritage of Metropolitan Pitirim Foundation, its thinking and active employees, and above all to the Chairman of the Board of the Foundation, Rector of MIIT Boris Alekseevich Levin. To the General Director of the Fund, Doctor of Military Sciences Professor Viktor Pavlovich Egorov.

Academician Leonid Grigorievich Ivashov,

and also to my son, Fyodor Igorevich Shumeiko, for collecting archival and reference materials.

o

Shumeiko I. World War II. Reboot / Igor NTumeyko - M.: Veche, 2007. - 352 p. - (Empire.VO).

[5VM 5-9533-1797-2 [5VM 978-5-9533-1797-9

Completely politically incorrect discussions about the European Parliament and the contours of Europe united by Hitler; about how "neutrals" and the innocent defeated worked for the Third Reich; about rights. who were born of the Great War, and about its instigators, as well as about the benefits of Rezun, Bukovsky and pigs looking for truffles.

The book is recommended as a guide for the RK department of the Russian Federation corporation.

BBK 66.3(2Ros)6

5-9533-1797-2 © Shumeiko I., 2007 978-5-9533-1797-9 © Veche Publishing House LLC, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

L.G. Ivashov. Foreword ee... oreeeeeeeeeeeattin lines, 5 Chapter |

The origin of the main theme and some of the external causes ... 8 Chapter 2

Adolf Hitler as a trust manager of CJSC "Europe" And Chapter 3

On the "Right of Leading the Great War"

and the fetuses returning under the HAND the lines of ini leleneiiinaini 19 Chapter 4

"The Last Argument of Kings"- chile nina tiiiiiiinininni 26 Chapter 5

A terminological crisis

The direction of the main blow - von Clausewitz-.- yin 50 Chapter 7

Disputes of historians with Rezun lines of the line of initninini 62 Chapter 8

"Too much Churchill!" and llllllllinlinlinlininni 81 Chapter 9

New top-managers of "United Europe" lines. 13 Chapter 10

About the property transferred to the trust management

(and a little about public order during the transmission period). 133 Chapter 1

Main Munichs of Czech HISTORY 140 yen

Igor Shumeiko

Chapter 12

How many columns were there? ee nina alan 157 Chapter 13

Was it easy for neutrals? (Case of Norway) 168 Chapter 14

On the measurement of "Resistances"ali linini lines 183 Chapter 15

Where was the gentleman then? (Baltic abacus) 193 Chapter 16

War and Justice

{Six feathers from each goose of the kingdom) for nshiivinit 210 Chapter 17

Facts and Theories232 Chapter 19

Problems of the RV Department of the Corporation "Russian Federation" 240 Chapter 19

"Duty Properly Understood" ini inneninatiillinnin 267 Chapter 20

Departed enemy - to a former ally

(And the rim, by the way, anniversary) and alninninne 285

Appendix lines of scientific research institute lenin ZI

Notes ini hoarfrost eninining: 317

Lev Anninsky. The devils waited for the babylzialinnia 335

Foreword

I confess to the reader that the first pages of the book aroused a certain distrust. I, a general and a doctor of historical sciences, had a chance to re-read a lot about the past world war. Here are multi-volume histories of the war, and monographic studies, both by our and foreign authors, and authentic documents of that era, and memoirs of military leaders, politicians, diplomats, etc., etc. Yes, and my own PhD thesis - also about her, albeit with a military-technical bias.

And then suddenly - either a lengthy pamphlet, or an essay, or a large feuilleton. In general, it is absolutely not a military-literary genre. But little by little, a desire to read further arose, and then, having "swallowed" the book, I felt disappointed that the last page had been read.

How did the author manage to arouse genuine interest in events and facts that seem to have been traveled many times and comprehensively described in tons of historical literature? The essence is in a new perspective of their reading, in a new assessment of their significance for the course and outcome of the war. The author, penetrating inside the event, pulls out its essence, hidden under historical dust, and presents the reader: here. Please, look, think.

So, he becomes an accuser of Czechoslovakia, which all historians and the public of the world considered a victim, a kind of defenseless lamb, given as a result of the Munich agreement to be torn to pieces by a German predator. But when

Igor Shumeiko

If you compare the ratio of the military forces of Germany and Czechoslovakia, think about the military industrial potential of the latter, about the surprisingly favorable nature of the terrain for defense, you clearly understand that Beneš and his government actually voluntarily capitulated to Hitler. And then Igor Shumeiko adds W. Churchill's vitata, which completes the picture: "And besides, the Skoda factories, the second most important arsenal in Europe, which since August 38th to September 39th produced as much production as all English factories during the same period.

And this huge "European workshop" (factories "Shkoda" and "ChKD") until the Second World War and throughout the war, regularly worked for the Wehrmacht without a single strike or sabotage. That is, the Czechs, in fact, fought against The USSR, on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the Victory, have declared themselves a country occupied by the Soviet Union and are destroying the symbols of the liberation of Prague by our troops.

The same is true for the Balts, Poles and other "victims" of the Soviet "occupation". Igor Shumeiko, through a deep analysis of "little things" and particulars, leads the reader to an understanding of rather large problems, shows the true face of the active players of the Second World War ... And connects those already distant events with the present, convincingly showing the transformation of views, withdrawals and assessments of military events. The prophetic phrase of I.V. Stalin, which he said back in 1945: "In this war we lost the best. And this will certainly have an effect", is developed by the author and acquires a modern sound. Especially against the background of the current continuous power-elite mediocrity, betrayal and hatred for the USSR and Russia.

By introducing little-known documents into circulation, the author denounces not only the current anti-elite, but also those "not the best" who came to the crucible of power after Stalin and tried to denigrate him, and Nobeda, and the people. For example, I first saw the new post-war program

World War II. Reboot

—

Stalin, which should change the essence of our state and society. Here are her outlines:

- detente of international tension,

- publicity

limited democracy, especially in the party,

- improving the life of the population,

— decentralization of the economy.

Here, too, is the preparation for the removal of the party nomenklatura layer from interfering in all spheres of society, the promotion of initiative and creativity, and the enhancement of the role of theoretical knowledge ("Without theory, we will perish").

The connection between the events of the last world war in the Balkans and the current situation in the former Yugoslavia is very interesting. Let's think about the words: "100% coincidence of likes and dislikes of "United (by Hitler) Europe" in 1941-1944 and "United (by Clinton) Europe" in 1992-1999... A dozen of Croats and Muslims were convicted field commanders, the Serbs have the whole state". Having become acquainted with how the pre-war and military situation in the Balkans developed, you come to the following conclusion: the war that was waged against the Serbs in 1941-1944 continued in the 1990s in a slightly changed configuration of the opposing forces. Hitler's allies - Croats, Albanians, Bosnians - have become loyal allies of NATO, the aces of the alliance are nothing but an updated model of a large Wehrmacht aimed at the Slavic world and Russia.

Igor Shumeiko concludes his work with an amazing generalizing conclusion: "And today the version of the Great War (outside of any pacts and time frames. — L.I.) sort of returns some participants "to the front line", reminding them which side they acted.

In general, the reader will find in this book a lot of new and interesting things.

Colonel General L.G. IVASHOV, Vice-President of the Academy of Geopolitical Problems

Chapter 1 The Origin of the Main Theme and Some of the Outside Causes

According to the established tradition, anniversaries (multiples of ten) — the opening of the Second Front — are widely celebrated in Europe. In 2004, Russia was invited to the 60th anniversary... A very complex range of feelings forces us to recall the conflicts of the previous 50th anniversary. Then, in 1994, Russia was not invited. The media was overwhelmed by the foam of controversy. France, the host of the festivities, including the parade of the Allied troops, answered diplomatically and cunningly: "But order you, Russians, did not land in June 44 in Normandy, did not liberate Paris." Ours were fuming: "But it is well known that at that moment 80% of German units, the best in composition, were fighting in Russia." The French (European parliamentarians, human rights activists, etc.): "Nova and themselves, expelling the Germans, established dominance no better ... again - Czech Republic, 68th year ... tanks" ...

I expect a reproach something like this: "What is this complex range of feelings? — just an insult to the French, who didn't invite me to the parade then."

But all the syllogisms of this book are directed not only against French hypocrisy.

Let us look at the map of Europe at the beginning of the decisive period of that war (June 1941). Everything is smeared, literally

World War II. Reboot E.

in a sense, brown paint. And, most importantly, one fundamental question has been smeared, obscured. Darker shade - Germany and allies: Italy, Finland, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria. Lighter - the countries captured: France, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Greece. The unconquered island is Great Britain, and... the pink eastern ocean is the USSR.

The main theses of the book are as follows:

1. Inequality of "equally shaded" countries.

The same color of Poland and Czechoslovakia is a lie. The Poles fought, left the ruins to the Germans. The Czechs handed over all of themselves intact. Only the Skoda and ChKD factories almost doubled the capacity of the fascist tank building! The fact is probably little known: in the thirties, the most important place and 40% of the world's sales of weapons and military equipment belonged to the Czech Republic. More about this in the chapter "Main "Munichs" of Czech history."

The same color of France and Yugoslavia is also a lie. The point is not only in the French capitulation, which transferred to Hitler in trust (trust) management the entire military-industrial

potential intact. This is being encouraged today by a kind of politically correct, equalizing perception:
“Well...France, the Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary — everything is one, everything is Eura! Everyone participates in the Eurovision Song Contest!

But in the Second World War, on the balance sheet of “United (Hitler) Europe”: Poland, Yugoslavia were captured farms (burnt down), and the Czech Republic, France were industrial megacities that were left entirely.

2. In any history of the Second World War, the following is recorded:

<... in all the occupied countries, a resistance movement has unfolded.” That is, for many political reasons, it was important to emphasize that “all nations have risen...” But, you know? The most powerful Resistance in terms of damage dealt to Hitler was in Germany... More on this in the chapter “Measurement of “Resistances””.

| No. Igor Shumeiko

We will exclude the Soviet Union from this “measuring list” for two reasons: a) it was not an “occupied country” 6) “measurement” is carried out precisely in countries that transferred their potential to Hitler “in trust management” and just for the purpose comparisons, comparisons: his, the transferred potential - and the corresponding “Resistance”.

That is, the Red and Black Chapels, Free France, the hero-pilot Saint-Exupery, the Little Prince - all this is beautiful and undeniable. But, as they sang in the First World War: “in the German war - only nushki in the price ... x, and in the “Second German War”, it turns out, too. The power of concerns, state potentials and the power of any, the most noble organizations are incomparable things. The Czech and French military-industrial complexes handed over to the Fuhrer are from the macro world, the underground from the micro world.

3. On the perpetrators of Hitler's rise to power. Partially about this - in the chapter "Adolf Hitler as a trust manager of CJSC "Europe"", and in more detail - in "Disputes between historians with Rezun", where the most ridiculous of the admittedly ridiculous answers for this question is also offered.

Chapter 2 Adolf Hitler as Trustee of CJSC Europe

The balance of forces in 1938 (1582 aircraft, 469 tanks, 2 million people - Czechs; and 2500 aircraft, 720 tanks, 2.2 million people - Germans) allowed Beneš even without any help (not received from France, rejected from the USSR) to stay for three months. According to estimates, this was until November 1938, before the annexation of Czechoslovakia. And then, having studied the quality of the “dowry”, the German generals admitted that they had avoided the biggest trouble, that the risk of defeat in Czechoslovakia in 1938 was even greater than in Poland in 1939 and in France in 1940.

Winston Churchill recalls: “...because of the fall of Czechoslovakia, we lost the strength of 35 divisions. And, besides, the Skoda factories, the second most important arsenal in Europe, fell into the hands of the enemy, which from August 38th to September 39th produced almost as much production as all English factories during the same period.

Estimate: not only 469 unfired tanks and 1582 aircraft hit the Germans. The main thing is factories. There is an interesting question for Czech historians: how long did the Škoda and ŷKD plants stand idle (maybe they went on strike) in connection with the change of the flag? Month or menu? About that
historical

[= Igor Shumeiko

rii "Skoda" - as the "main engine" of the German concern "Hermann Goering Werke" - in the chapter "On property transferred for management".

Think about what a terrible thing it is - inertia, coarseness of perception! Even in our "Histories of the Second World War" - in the obligatory, on-duty chapter - "Resistance Movement in Europe" - it lists, for example, "French miners' strike".

And somehow it is accepted mechanically, swallowed up by readers for several generations. Strike is a word from such a peaceful lexicon as "house slippers". Strikes are a legal, polite, peaceful form of dialogue with employers.

Take this idea to its logical conclusion... After all, a "strike" can become a means, a threat, only in the case of well-established joint work.

Only in a well-functioning mine or factory can a "strike" mean something! ...

But if the resistance movements of the French and Czechs are incomparable with the state potentials in the service of Hitler, then with what can they be compared, correctly compared? With the German Resistance. Certainly.

Military historian Jacques Bergier: "The Red Chapel" definitely destroyed more than 200,000 of the Soldiers of the Fascist Bloc." Goering, at Nuremberg: "she destroyed at least 10 of our divisions."

But in Germany, except for the Red Chapel. Moscow-oriented was also the "Black Chapel": diplomats, senior officials, field marshals, generals. In 1938, she, the "Black Chapel" headed by Beck, Brauchitsch prepared the overthrow of Hitler. Field Marshal Winleben, Commander of the 3rd Berlin Military District. rehearsed the capture of the Reichscanielaria. Even the SS occupied

C

World War II. Reboot 1

waiting position. For two months "the coin stood on its edge", and. as the conspirators of 1944 admitted before their execution, only the "Munich summit" (!) — the main foreign and domestic political trump card — saved Hitler. They, the German resistance, "knocked out of action" — four field marshals (arrested, executed, - committed suicide): Kluge, Winleben, Rommel, Beck, and also the chief of intelligence, Admiral Canaris, who really did a lot of work for the allies (Spain's non-entry into the war is only one of the thousands of Canaris' most famous merits). of the General Staff of the 30s, Colonel-General von Hammerstein Ekvord, commander of the 4th Panzer Group Hoepner, Hitler's military adviser Wilhelm Scheidt (repeatedly handed over secret plans to the allies), Eduard Wagner (chief quartermaster, head of the supply department of the General Staff), ambassador in Rome, Hassel, head of the French military administration Stulpnagel ...

The choice line also split Yugoslavia. The Serbs (though headed by the Croat Tito) organized a partisan army that attracted 12 or more divisions from Germany and its allies. The Croats created a state, on the contrary, giving the fascist bloc 5 divisions. And it is very interesting that this choice of Hitler is superimposed by the choice of the Euro of the 1990s: who to "root" for in the newly split Yugoslavia? Here and there - terror, ethnic cleansing. But who will we bomb in the end? ..

And more recently, a similar choice: Ukraine. Who counted the votes correctly and in which elections? And here and there - only protocols of election commissions and mutual accusations. There is basically no other source of information. And again, obviously playing along with the region where the SS division "Galicia" was formed - and "where there are partisans, Krasnodon, the Young Guard, they probably think worse there." Trend!..

1 Igor Shumeiko

How United Europe-1 was formed

We are introducing indexing so as not to be confused with the current "United Europa-2", which coincides with Europe First - in geography, a set of nations, and, as we see, in some political preferences. Perhaps, even for sure, the current politicians, who so solemnly proclaimed "O.E.-2", will also be unpleasantly reminded of this predecessor. But what can you do, there was a Vel United (Hitler) Euna. And to her birth. It turns out that liberals were also involved, and even Nobel Peace Prize winners.

Today there is already a whole trend: criticism of globalism and political correctness. The era and the world seem strange and unsteady, the stupidity of today's politicians is unique. But no. Here is a portrait of the time between the world wars in Churchill's memoirs, so to speak - "The Chosen places."

"... What was imposed on the Germans was the ideal that the liberals of the West aspired to. France demanded borders along the Rhine, but England and the United States believed that the inclusion of areas with a German population was contrary to the principle of self-determination of nations. Clemenceau had to agree to this in exchange for Anglo-American guarantees. And later the US Senate, disregarding Wilson's signature, did not ratify the guarantee agreement ... They said that we needed to know the SNLA constitution better. At the Washington Conference, 21 years old made far-reaching proposals for naval weapons, and the British and Americans began to zealously sink their battleships and destroy military bases. This was done on the basis of a strange logic, according to which it is immoral to disarm the vanquished, unless the whitewashers also lose their weapons. Until 1931, the victors concentrated their efforts on extorting annual reparations from Germany. But payments could only be made thanks to

World War II. Reboot

Rican loans, so that the whole procedure was reduced to absurdity. The result of the conference (Locarno, 1925) is a general guarantee agreement and arbitration agreements between Germany and France, Germany and Belgium, Germany and Poland, Germany and Czechoslovakia. Austin Chamberlain received the Order of the Garter and the Nobel Peace Prize..." And now think about it: the Nobel Prize for Peace was given to a man (Chamberlain) who paved the way for World War II and... it just so happens – it's for this "breaking through" deed (in Locarno). This fact is not advertised very much, probably in order not to discredit the award, which was received in recent years ... "well, just holy people ... just angels of political correctness." Churchill's memoirs fill a historical void. The policy of England in the 1930s still needs some kind of interpretation, and Churchill gives it. By the way, Churchill received his Nobel Prize in 1953 - not like Chamberlain and Gorbachev - "for peace", but "for literature". In addition to his memoirs of the Second World War, there will also be occasion to quote from The History of the English-speaking Peoples. And Churchill's memoirs are almost Chestertonian elegance plus participation in all the details of politics. Although it is difficult to call the present picture of the 1920-1930s politics. A twenty-year-old orgy of pacifism. Not supporting British disarmament meant losing the election for sure. The Oxford Students' Union takes a public oath never to fight for your country. In France the communists of Maurice Thorez have, in modern terms, a "blocking package". In order to pass the law on two-year service, Minister Lavan has to fly to Moscow. Churchill: "... only the Soviets could allow a significant part of the French, who had confidence in them, to support this law. (Stalin's "go-ahead" has been received. The French army can now reach the bar of 100 divisions. Over all this, you will agree, a draft of nonsense is already hovering. But Churchill elegantly avoids assessments and

{© Igor Shumeiko

continues). After Laval asked Stalin: "Could you do something to encourage Catholics in Russia? It would help me so much with my dad." "Wow! exclaimed Stalin. - Dad! How many divisions does he have? "...

Roosevelt and Churchill, while dividing Europe into spheres of influence with Stalin, not only recognized it - they jointly designed a system of guarantees. Multilevel UN, Security Council with

five permanent members, the division of Germany, spheres of influence, or, one might say, spheres of security, buffers. So the tanks in the Czech Republic in 1968 are a consequence of how the war ended, how it went and how the war started. Munich investigation...

For a hundred and fifty years now, the aphorism has been roaming: "Generals are always preparing for the last war." "But they get paid for the future," one witty journalist recently speculated. Maybe our rulers were mistaken, insuring themselves in the 68th goal, according to the canons of the 40th. But...—the proverb doesn't lie—all governments, all General Staffs do this—prepare for the war in which they participated. Those who did not compete with the Wehrmacht for 4 years have a completely different political heredity, military doctrine.

And there is no need to nod: "Yes, it was the case, they tried to reinforce socialism with tanks in 1968." Also, a "prominent Marxist" - General of the Army Pavlovsky (organizer of the operation "Czech Republic-68"). It is better to tell the truth: "We defended our forward bastion, our bridgehead, our sphere of influence." Or answer like this: "Before the Soviet tanks of 1968, there were Czech tanks in Minsk, Smolensk and Stalingrad in Prague

Yes, it is possible without any geopolitics. what is there. Imagine...

Beer pub. Everyone sits and looks into their circles. The big man tumbles in. Courageous. They are waiting. Big man grabs for

World War II. Reboot ||

lankan of the first lan. That one is a dick! - gives the attacker a purse and a revolver. happened in his pocket. The big man grabs Monsieur and gets another purse. knife, brass knuckles. The last, comrade, who decided to resist, gets both bullet and stab wounds. Roughened and embittered, he nevertheless twists the big man and... leaves him on the floor - for some reason there is no way out of this strange bar. Barely recovered from these disgusting scenes of violence, the pan and monsieur demand the return of their property. "We know. comrade, that now you won't need a revolver with a knife to protect yourself against the big man." And the comrade, instead of the simplest answer: "How can you know that?", starts mumbling something about socialism...

Denmark, Belgium, Holland also had a choice: to transfer their state potentials to the Germans or not. And now they will call the very formulation of such a question savagery, fanaticism. And it's already somehow impolite to remind that someone had to start a real resistance, as in Warsaw, Stalingrad, Leningrad. Millions of prisoners, factories were seized from us too. but those who dared to resist regarded this only as a criminal mistake or betrayal. And as a result - SMERSH, detachments, repressions. This choice determines everything from politics to the post-war psyche. But only after the war? Many ugly actions on the eve of 1941 are, after all, the preparations of a man who has narrowed his eyes and made up his mind. By the same pub analogy: he threw off a Baltic spectator and armed himself with his chair. The "non-aggression pact" was actually the choice of the place and the minute of the upcoming fight...

I have already asked Czech historians a question about the Skoda, and now they have one slight reproach about the death of their own compatriot. A very famous case, described a million times: one Prague student saw Soviet tanks in 1968 and, offended in national feelings

15 Igor Shumeiko

stvah, set himself on fire ... It can be seen, you, sir. history was taught to him rather poorly. After all, you could save the guy, give him a vaccine ...

Having told, for example, how the "Hero of Munich" Chamberlain reported to the Nalata of the Commons after Hitler took not only the Sudetenland, but the whole of Czechoslovakia.

<... we are simply witnessing a revision of the boundaries established by the Treaty of Versailles. I don't know if there are people who think that the borders will always remain the same. I

I doubt it very much. I think I have said enough about Czechoslovakia..."

Well now. What does this difference mean in the lists of those invited to the European parades in 1994 and 2004? Maybe the owners are such intellectuals, aesthetes. And Russia-1994 is unattractive, and they didn't want to see how the drunken president-conductor would suddenly try his hand at the parade, maybe even in tambour-major? Or vice versa: they are such pragmatists, they invited Russia-2004, and at \$100 per barrel they will invite Kuwait and the Emirates to the Parade, "like the heroes of the Second Front"?

And that, and another, and the third. They have many faces, like Proteus, they are lighter and more maneuverable, they are really more free. Free from all of the above.

Chapter 3 About the "Right of Those Leading the Great War" and about those who turned up under the arm

And "the same pact?", "the same taste: Molotov-Ribbentrop?", "Soviet aggression in the Baltics?"
). An inquiry into the nature of these accusations. In fact, this entire book is about it. Deciding on the Great War has the right to the Great Maneuver. But what is this term - "Big War", and is it legitimate to introduce it?

The answer will be detailed, with the involvement of some of my previous publications, including Hugo Grotius, the author of the concepts of "natural law" and most of the provisions of the "law of war and peace". In the meantime, a few historical precedents.

So, for example, the Englishmen who decided on the Great War of the 10th century knew to themselves that they were the most irreconcilable, the most final enemies of Napoleon, and with this self-justification they could conclude as many truces "with Boni" as they wanted, sign with treaty of Amiens, and then to destroy a completely neutral Denmark ("just so that the Danish fleet does not accidentally get to Boni").

No. AMATEUR INQUIRIES And who, in fact, is this Boni?

2) Igor Shumeiko

"Boney" was a nickname that did not leave the pages of the then British newspapers. Diminutive of "Bonaparte".

And the one who demanded that only "Napoleon" be addressed to him — he, after all, considered the simple, undistorted "Bonaparte" as the greatest insult to himself and France. So "Boney" in British (and only in British) newspapers was not just a joke: it was a Pledge of irreconcilable enmity, a Pledge of a war of annihilation. Just as 500 years before that, innocent and useless Mongolian ambassadors were slaughtered, knowing that after that there could be no peace with the Mongols.
never.

And the Soviet newspapers of those years with caricatures of Hitler - this is the same Pledge. And the mutual moral "incitement" of fascists and communists is a completely serious, "material" argument.

And the fact that we are blamed for "the same Pact" and the changed tone of the Soviet newspapers of 1940... it's as if the surviving inhabitants of Auschwitz would start to blame the Russian soldiers who opened the gate: "You are near Vyaz- mine screwed up, and near Kharkov - twice. And in Stalingrad they dragged on for a long time, and near Kursk. And it was near Leningrad... And as a result, they came to liberate us much later than they should have been... according to our calculations... And, of course, it was impossible to enter the three Baltic republics."

But the "coincidences" are innumerable — it was in the Baltic that Great Britain wrote the brightest page in the code of this right. The "Great War" was waged by her in the 17th-20th centuries against Napoleon. The fleet of this, as you know, was defeated at Trafalgar, and the invasion of Britain did not seem to threaten. But Napoleon, purely theoretically, could create a new fleet for himself? Could. And wishing to recreate the fleet, Napoleon, using his continental power, probably

World War II. Reboot 21

otherwise, could he capture some country with a significant fleet and "attach it to the cause"? Quite. And who else in Europe has a "significant fleet"? And here is the Kingdom of Denmark. But it is still pursuing a line of impeccable neutrality. And suddenly what will change? Moreover, according to the research of one of our (British) writers: "Some kind of rot in the Danish state" W. Shakespeare. "Hamlet"...

Need to insure.

On July 26, 1807, a British squadron left Yarmouth, consisting of 25 ships, 40 frigates and small craft. It was followed by several detachments of an armada of 380 transport ships with a 20,000-strong landing force. [August the British squadron appeared in the Bølynø Belt. On August 8, the British ambassador Jackson appeared to the Crown Prince Regent Frederick and stated that England knew Napoleon's intention to force Denmark into an alliance with France. England cannot allow this to happen, and in order to ensure that this does not happen, she demands that Denmark hand over her entire fleet to her and that English troops be allowed to occupy Zeeland, the island on which the capital of Denmark is located. The prince refused. Then the British fleet bombarded Copenhagen for six days, and then landed troops. Half of the city burned down, more than two thousand of its inhabitants died in the fire. The aged (72-year-old) General Peyman, who commanded the Danish troops, capitulated. The British took away the entire Danish fleet, burned the shipyards and the naval arsenal. Prince Frederik did not approve the surrender and ordered Peyman to be brought to court-martial...

But. maybe the 1807 example is too outdated? After all, since then, so many humanists and human rights activists "shone in the land of Europe". Then here is an example from the very actual 1940. Iceland at that time was part of Denmark (we will not go into the details of their union now). And when Hitler van

Igor Shumeiko

The 1940 relay captured Denmark, Great Britain, without declaring war, without declaring anything at all, captured Iceland. The reason is the most elementary: Denmark falls under Hitler anyway, but it is impossible that all of it, as a whole. The island of Iceland will come in handy for the war.

And how useful! Just imagine that Iceland became German - then it is inevitable: not a single Anglo-American convoy with strategic cargo would reach Murmansk. Moreover, not a single convoy to Russia would have left American ports due to the absolute impossibility of bypassing Iceland with German bases...

British law, as you know, is based on "precedent". The USSR also waged a "Great War" against Faugism. There have already been direct battles with the Germans and Italians in Spain, with Japan at Khasan and Khalkhin Gol. Truce, pacts with the main enemy, of course, were concluded (as well as the British with Napoleon), but this did not change the main fact: the final instance of resolving the "Great historical conflict" would be the fight between the USSR and Germany. And join us in 1940 th year of the most important strategic foothold, the three republics, falls short of the British-Danish precedent in all respects. Their governments did not open hostilities - once;

two.

Today's politically correct historians click on the abacus: "So, the year 1940 - the USSR crushed three democratic states - three knuckles to the left, minus."

We can agree ... Although with some amendments. Latvia at that time ceased to be a "democratic republic" - the dictatorship of Ulmanis. Lithuania had declared a year earlier that it could not vouch for itself, nor for its territorial integrity, nor for its neutrality.

World War II. Reboot 23

The story was like this. According to the Treaty of Versailles, the former German city of Memel (with the surrounding area) was called Klaipeda and was transferred to Lithuania.

Memel. By the way, in a certain historical period it was the capital and the last foothold of Prussia, which was being achieved by Napoleon. It is not known whether the victorious powers remembered this when they took this most important port from Germany, the main thing is different: they guaranteed protection to Lithuania - her and her gains. These guarantees were absolutely similar to the guarantees given to Poland, in pursuance of which, in fact, war was declared on Germany (5 months after Clayda).

On March 20, 1939, German Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop announced to his Lithuanian colleague I. Urbshys: "<... if the Lithuanian government is inclined to return the Klaipeda region by agreement, then the German government is ready to meet halfway and satisfy the interests of Lithuania in Klaipeda port. If the Lithuanian government does not follow this reasonable path, then the Klaipeda region will be returned to Germany in a different way. If clashes took place there and at least one German died, then it would no longer be us, the politicians, who would be engaged in this matter, but the troops. starting a hike, it is not known where they would stop. After the outbreak of hostilities, the German government would no longer enter into any negotiations.

Without waiting for an official response from Lithuania, Adolf Hitler went to Memel on the battleship Deutschland, the flagship of the German Navy. The Lithuanians were given official and humiliating advice: "In order to avoid wasting time, send plenipotentiaries to Berlin on a special plane to sign a document on the transfer of the Memel region to Germany."

The armed forces of Lithuania were: a cavalry brigade and three infantry divisions with a total number of 24 thousand people, with 44 light tanks and 110 aircraft. And only one military training ship with six machine guns

24 Igor Shumeiko

tami and two Oerlikon cannons of 22 mm caliber. In military terms, Lithuania's position was hopeless.

But in order to get help from Britain and France, Lithuania had to reject Hitler's demands, turn to guarantor countries, and be attacked. And then the Second World War would have started in April, and not in May 1939.

As Lithuanian historians state: "<... it would be possible to write a heroic page in history with the blood of thousands of soldiers. But in territorial terms, Lithuania would only lose in the long run. After all, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Germany, von Ribbentrop, made it clear that by starting a battle, the Lithuanians would lose the whole country. Of course, it hurts a lot when they cut off a hand, but it's stupid to substitute your head as well ... "

March 21 The Council of Ministers, "finding no other way out, considers that it is compelled to accept the demand of the German government. Before the threat posed by Germany, the Council of Ministers finds it impossible to fulfill the requirements of Article 5 of the convention concluded between Lithuania, the British Empire, France, Italy and Japan on the territory of Klaipeda. The Minister of Foreign Affairs is instructed only to inform the plenipotentiary ministers of France and Great Britain in Kaunas about the demand of the German government to return the Klaipeda region to the Reich."

That is, based on its national interests (plus a reminder that Germany will take into account the interests of Lithuania in the port of Klaipeda), Lithuania does not turn to the guarantor countries for help and gives up Memel. Significantly strengthening the position of Germany in the Baltic - and also significantly worsening the position of anyone who decides on a "Great War" with Hitler.

From the point of view of the current situation and modern understanding of international law, one can endlessly

World War II. Reboot

there is no room for arguing about what the annexation of those three republics by the Soviet Union meets the signs of aggression, and what does not. But just in order for the international situation itself to become "modern", politically correct - in general. the way it is now - and the liquidation of the Nazi Reich was required, the victory of the Bolshoi War!

Of course, if the Balts of the Munich era would sit in a time machine, or rather, get into it with all their republics, and fly immediately to 2006, where you have both the Council of Europe and PACE ... But even this fantasy is not so transcendental in comparison with the cynicism of the "Klaipeda heroes" teaching Russia: how, where, when it was necessary to carry out military operations against Hitler.

But perhaps the precedent of Britain insuring itself with Denmark in 1807 is too old, with Iceland in 1940, too insignificant? And "in the cultural twentieth century." Stalin really should have somehow organized a communication session and consulted with Havel, Landsbergis, Clinton and Madeleine Albright: how should the "Big War" be waged?

Well, then, here is another example, again from 1940. True, here again the acting line of Britain, but this is precisely because it is she, island Britain, who more often decides to confront at any cost.

Chapter 4 "The last argument of kings."

Many are ready to equate the fire and the fire brigade. W. Churchill

Question 1. What is the most significant naval battle of World War II in the Eurolel theater of military operations.

Question number 2. Name its members.

Correct answer: 1. Battle on July 3, 1940 at Mers-el-Kebira (Algerian coast).

The answer to question number 2 will probably surprise many.

AMATEUR INQUIRIES And who, in fact, fought at this Mers-el-Kebira?

Correct answer: 2. English and French.

It is hard to believe, and yet: "Mers el-Kebira" is the largest military clash in European maritime theaters - both in terms of the composition of the opposing forces. 1 (three battleships against four), and the tactical result: one battleship sunk, two damaged, not counting dozens of destroyers and auxiliary vessels.

World War II. Reboot 27

The strategic operation of the British Navy, which aimed to eliminate the danger of strengthening the enemy fleets by French ships, received the code name "Catapult". The concept of the operation provided for taking control (capture, disarmament, internment) or destruction of the maximum possible number of combat units of the French Navy at various bases, both on British territory and beyond its borders.

On June 15, the French notified the British Government of their intention to conclude a jeremy with the Germans. Churchill's reply: "Our treaty forbidding separate negotiations for an armistice or peace was concluded with the French Republic and not with any government or

statesman. Therefore, the honor of Franini is associated with him. However, on the condition that the Franciosian fleet be sent to British ports immediately and pending negotiations. His Majesty's Government give their full consent to the French Government making an inquiry to ascertain the terms of the armistice for France. His Majesty's Government, determined to continue the war, exclude themselves entirely from any participation in the above request for a truce."

In the early morning of July 3, all French ships stationed in British ports were captured by detachments of the Royal Marines. Armed resistance was offered by the crews of only two ships: the destroyer Mistral and the submarine Surkuf. This indirectly confirmed the fears of the British that another part of the French fleet would fall into the hands of the Germans. After all, apart from Force X neutralized in Alexandria and several cruisers, destroyers, the aircraft carrier Bearn and small ships scattered around the world, only two very old battleships Pari and Courbet, 2 super-destroyers (leader), 8 destroyers, 7 submarines — no more than ten hours in total

28 Igor Shumeiko

ty French fleet, judging by the displacement, even less, judging by their real strength. 90% of the French naval moshgi were concentrated in the Mediterranean ports.

Now the floor is given to E. Granovsky, the author of the excellent work "Trafalgar's Genius. Operation of the British Navy against the ships of the French fleet in Mers-el-Kebir".

"Having retired shortly before the start of the war, 57-year-old Vice Admiral James Somerville was now urgently returned to the service of His Majesty to carry out a responsible task: to give the French an ultimatum demanding to surrender the ships to the British or leave for American ports, and in if they refuse to obey, destroy them. What was the reason for such a choice of commander? Among other English admirals, Somerville stood out, perhaps, for some eccentricity. "As a person," comments historian Warren Tute, "Somerville was an active, witty extrovert who relished his reputation as a showman. (For example, on the captain's bridge, the Auth. stood with a parrot on his shoulder). Such is the tradition that has been going on since Nelson's time. The ability to produce an effect is an integral part of the patura of any outstanding leader."

Yes, this is a very interesting moment in its own way. General unification, gigantic armies of the 20th century made us forget many features of the true "military style" of past eras. Really. when all the clothes put on overcoats, when an all-out war is unfolding, there is no one to remember about... About the fact, in particular, that when the wars were noble, class, there was much more room for all kinds of "self-expression". And eccentricity was recognized as a manifestation of the nature of any outstanding leader ... Under Waterloo (and this is well noticed in Bondarchuk's film), the highest British officers paraded in front of the ranks in the hats and frock coats of their clubs. Remembering

World War II. Reboot 29

this, one can correctly understand the jokes of our military genius - Suvorov, who sometimes sobbed at military councils (for example, at the most difficult moment of the Alpine campaign), jumped, crowed like a rooster.

You can also break down Kutuzov's contempt for smooth and correct reasoning, and his sending (sometimes even with snoring) to military councils. (Contempt for military wisdom is, for example, Leo Tolstoy's artistic conjecture, but Kutuzov's drowsiness at military councils is a fact of history.)

I deliberately detain the reader's attention precisely on the eccentricity of real military geniuses. Where you have to fight for real (the Russian army, the English fleet), they understand

that eccentricity is the best remedy for stupidity, formalism, fearful politeness. From everything-everything that already in our days will let down the floor this unique term - Political correctness!

Politically correct, correct, everything was thoroughly calculated by Lord Chamberlain. The entire Munich Treaty of 1938 was also politically correct in form – this book will prove it. The British and the French even calculated the amount of compensation to the Czechs for the herds of cattle, which they will not be able to drive away from the Sudetenland! Entire areas of politics will also be cited (for example, in the religious issue), where the Fuhrer himself was certainly politically correct.

And Suvorov was exentric. Kutuzov and Nelson. And Admiral James Somerville, who won the most significant (in the European theater) naval battle of the Second World War and went out on the bridge dressed up as Captain Flint, with a parrot on his shoulder, was also anti-politically correct. It attacked the fleet of a country with which Britain was not at war (like the USSR with Poland in 1939) and, in addition to those sunk French ships, it had another exceptionally important, almost decisive impact on the course of World War II. about which few people mentioned

Igor Shumeiko

passes. But on page 23 this fact is given, and you. I think you will agree that the Somerville battle of Mers-el-Kebir should take its toll. a well-deserved place in the history of World War II.

“He (James Somerville) was not expected to have an excessive service zeal, but such an out-of-the-ordinary operation required a performer to match.

No one in the Navy, from the cabin boy to the Lord of the Admiralty, was enthusiastic about the prospect of fighting against the French. The militant initiative came from above, from the War Cabinet headed by Churchill. As a result of the military council held in the evening of June 30 in the admiral's salon of the battlecruiser Hood, which, in addition to three admirals and staff ranks, was attended by the commanders of all large ships, as well as the 8th and 3rd destroyer flotillas, Somerville in noon | July reported to the Admiralty that he was categorically against the use of force. The commander of the Mediterranean Fleet, Andrew Cunningham, joined this opinion: “The use of force in Oran can have serious consequences.” The answer from London came at 18.46 of the same day: “The British government has firmly decided to destroy the French ships if none of the terms of the ultimatum is accepted.”

A parting government telegram to the Commander of Force H said: “You are entrusted with one of the most unpleasant and difficult tasks that the British naval commanders have ever faced, but we have opted for you and we believe that you are - fill your debt to the end.

In my opinion, it seems that Churchill in this telegram was styled after Admiral Nelson's famous last flag signal, before the opening of fire at the Battle of Trafalgar: “England hopes. that each one will do his duty.”

Connection "H" (H) Somerville included: battlecruiser "Hood", battleships "Resolution" and "Valient", aircraft

World War II. Reboot

set "Ark Royal", light cruisers "Aretyuza" and "Enterprise", || destroyers. In Mers-el-Kebir, chosen as the first object of attack, were the French battleships Dunkirk. "Strasbourg", "Provence", "Brittany", leaders "Volta", "Mogador", "Tiger", "Lynx", "Kersaint" and "Herribl", seaplane carrier "Commandant Test". In Oran (a few miles to the east) there were destroyers, guards, minesweepers, and unfinished ships transferred from Toulon.

Formation "H" approached Mers-el-Kebir on the morning of July 3, 1940.

In Somerville's ultimatum, written on behalf of "His Majesty's Government", after reminders of joint military service, German perfidy, and an earlier agreement of 18 June between the British and French governments that, before capitulating on land, the French fleet would join to the British or sink, the French commander of the naval forces in Mers-el-Kebir and Oran were offered a choice of four options for action:

- 1) go to sea and join the British fleet to continue the fight until victory over Germany and Italy;
- 2) go to sea with reduced crews to go to British ports, after which the French sailors will be immediately repatriated, and the ships will be kept for France until the end of the war (full monetary compensation was offered for losses and damage);
- 3) in case of unwillingness to generally allow the possibility of using French ships against the Germans and Italians, so as not to violate the truce with them, go out under an English escort with reduced crews to French ports in the West Indies (for example, in Martynick) or to US ports, where the ships will be disarmed and kept until the end of the war, and the crews will be repatriated;
- 4) sink the ships within six hours..,

Igor Shumeiko

"In case of refusal of the above proposal, I have orders from His Majesty's Government to use all necessary forces to prevent your ships from falling into the hands of Germans or Italians.

Now imagine all the "options" of the French Admiral Jensch. Germans in Paris. The French government has concluded a truce, maybe close to capitulation, but it is his, the French government, trying to save the country in the current conditions. Surrendering the ships to the British means violating the terms of the armistice and, according to the German ultimatum received that morning, a "revision of the terms of the armistice" will follow (of course, in the direction of making the conditions more difficult for France). And even to flood them by the order of the commander-in-chief that remained in force, he cannot. All that's left is to fight. It's even wild to imagine: for the first time since 1815 (Waterloo), the French will fight the British... with whom they fought side by side for another week!

And imagine now the variants of the British admiral: in front of him are not some dodgy neutrals, but heroic sailors, his former fighting friends. Which are just the least guilty of the fact that the ground forces of France are defeated. Their combat work with the British was quite successful. (And no Vaclav Havel around, no Gorbachev with Novodvorskaya, and no one from PACE - to at least consult: shoot fighting friends, OR...).

At 1050, the destroyer Foxhound raised a signal: "If the terms of the ultimatum are not accepted, Admiral Somerville will not allow the French ships to leave the harbor." In confirmation of this, British seaplanes at 12.30 dropped several magnetic mines on the main fairway.

The ultimatum expired at 14:00. At 13.11, a new signal was raised on the Foxhound: "If you accept offers. hoist a square flag on the mainmast: otherwise I open fire at 14.1 |".

World War II. Reboot

From the moment the English destroyer appeared in the harbor of Mers-el-Kebir, the French ships parted pairs, the crews dispersed to combat posts. The coastal batteries were now ready to open fire. 42 fighters stood at the airfields, warming up the engines for the launch. All the ships in Oran were ready to go to sea, and 4 submarines were just waiting for an order to

form a barrier between Cape Anguil and Cape Falcon. Minesweepers have already cleared the fairway from English mines. All French forces in the Mediterranean were alerted, the 3rd squadron in Toulon of four heavy cruisers and 12 destroyers and six cruisers in Algiers were ordered to go to sea ready for battle and rush to connect with Admiral Jensch, about which he was supposed to warn the British.

And Somerville was already on a combat course. His squadron in the ranks of the wake was 14,000 meters north-north-west of Mers el-Kebir, heading - 70, speed - 20 knots. At [6.54 (at 17.54 British time)) the first salvo was fired. Fifteen-inch shells from the Resolution fell close short of range into the pier, behind which the French ships stood, bombarding them with a hail of stones and fragments. A minute and a half later, the first one answered "Provence", firing 340-mm shells right between the masts of the Dunkirk standing to his right. Admiral Jensch was not at all going to fight at anchor, just a cramped harbor did not allow all ships to start moving at the same time (which the British were counting on!). Battleships it was ordered to line up in a column in the order: "Strasbourg", "Dunkirk", "Provence", "Brittany". Super destroyers had to go to sea on their own. "Strasbourg", the stern mooring lines and the anchor chain of which were given away even before the hit the first shell into the pier, began to move immediately. And as soon as he left the parking lot, when a shell hit the pier, the fragments of which broke the halyards on the ship, the signal rail and pierced the pipe. At 17.10 (18.10) the captain of the 1st

4 Igor Shumeiko

The rank of Louis Collins led the Strasbourg to the main fairway and headed for the sea at a 15-knot course. Behind him rushed 6 destroyers.

When a salvo of 381-mm shells hit the pier, the Dunkirk gave up the mooring lines and poisoned the stern chain. The tug, helping to weigh anchor, was forced to cut off the mooring lines when the second salvo also hit the pier. The commander of the Dunkirk ordered that the tanks with aviation gasoline be immediately emptied and at 1700 gave the order to open fire with the main caliber. Later, 130-mm guns also came into play. Since Dunkirk was the closest ship to the British, Hood, a former partner in hunting down German raiders, concentrated his fire on it. At the moment when the French ship began to move away from its anchorage, the first shell from the "Hood" hit him in the stern and, passing through the hangar and non-commissioned officers' cabins, exited through the side plating 2.5 meters below the waterline. This shell did not explode because the thin plates it pierced were not enough to cock the fuse. However, in its passage through the Dunkirk, it broke part of the port side electrical wiring, disabled the crane for lifting seaplanes, and caused the port side fuel tank to flood. The return fire was quick and accurate, although distance determination was difficult due to the terrain and being between the Dunkirk and the British fort Stanton.

At about the same time, Brittany was hit, and on 07.03 a 381-mm shell hit Provence. who was waiting for the Dunkirk to enter the fairway in order to follow him. A fire started in the stern of the Provence and a large leak opened. I had to stick the ship to the shore with its nose at a depth of 9 meters. On July 17, the fire engulfed the Brittany from bow to stern, and two minutes later the old battleship began to capsize and suddenly exploded, taking the lives of 977 crew members. The rest began to be rescued

World War II. Reboot 35

from the Kommandant Test hydro-air transport, which miraculously avoided hits during the entire battle.

The Dunkirk, entering the fairway with a 12-knot course, was hit by a salvo of three 381-mm shells. The first hit in the roof of the tower number 2. strongly pushing the armor. Most of the projectile ricocheted and fell to the ground about 2,000 meters from the ship. A piece of armor or part of a projectile hit the loading tray inside the right "half-tower", igniting the first two quarters of the powder cartridges being unloaded. All the servants on the right side perished in the smoke and flames, but the left "half-tower" continued to operate – the armored partition isolated the damage.

The second shell hit next to the 2-gun 130-mm starboard turret, closer to the center of the ship. and pierced the 115-mm armored deck. The projectile severely damaged the reloading compartment of the turret, blocking the supply of ammunition. Continuing its movement towards the center of the ship, it broke through two anti-shatter bulkheads and exploded in the air conditioning and fan compartment. The compartment was completely destroyed, almost all the personnel died. In the meantime, in the reloading compartment on the starboard side, several cartridge cases caught fire and several 130-mm shells loaded into the elevator exploded. And here all the servants were killed. An explosion also occurred at the air duct to the forward engine room. Hot gases, flames and thick clouds of yellow smoke penetrated into the compartment through the armor grating in the lower armored deck, where 20 people died and only ten managed to escape, and all the mechanisms failed. This hit turned out to be very serious, as it led to a power outage due to which the fire control system failed. The intact bow turret had to continue firing under local control.

The third shell fell into the water next to the starboard side a little further aft from the second. dived under the 225-mm armor belt and, having broken through all the structures, exploded. Explosion

36 Igor Shumeiko

destroyed the lower armored deck throughout these compartments, the armored bevel above the fuel tank. Shell fragments caused a fire in the right boiler, damaged pipeline valves and broke the main steam pipeline between the boiler and the turbine unit. The escaping superheated steam with a temperature of 350 degrees caused fatal burns to the personnel of the KO (boiler room) standing in open places.

On the Dunkirk, after these hits, the internal shafts continued to operate, which gave a speed of no more than 20 knots. Damage to the starboard cables caused a short interruption in the power supply to the stern until the port side network was turned on. I had to switch to manual steering. With the failure of one of the main substations, bow emergency diesel generators were turned on. The emergency lighting came on, tower no. continued to conduct fairly frequent fire on the flagship "Hood".

In total, before receiving the order to cease fire at 17.19, Dunkirk fired forty 330-mm shells at the British flagship, the volleys of which fell very tightly. By this point, after 13 minutes of shooting almost immobile ships in the harbor, the situation no longer looked unpunished for the British. "Dunkirk" and coastal batteries were intense fire. which became more and more accurate, "Strasbourg" with destroyers almost went to sea. All that was missing was the Motador, which, when leaving the harbor, slowed down to let the tugboat pass, and a second later received a 381-mm shell in the stern. The explosion detonated 16 depth charges and the destroyer's stern was torn off. But he was able to stick his nose to the shore at a depth of about 6 meters and, with the help of small ships approaching from Oran, began to put out the fire. The British, satisfied with the sinking of one and the damage of three ships, turned to the fuse and put up a smokescreen. "Strasbourg" with five destroyers went on a breakthrough. "Lynx" and "Gigr" attacked

.-

World War II. Reboot b

depth charges on the Proteus submarine, preventing her from attacking the battleship. The Strasbourg itself opened heavy fire on the English destroyer Wrestler, which was guarding the exit from the harbor, forcing it to quickly retreat under the cover of a smoke screen. French ships began to develop full speed. At Cape Canastel they were joined by six more destroyers from Oran. To the northwest, within firing range, the English aircraft carrier Ark Royal was visible, practically defenseless against 330-mm and 130-mm shells. But the fight didn't happen. On the other hand, six Swordfish with 124-kg bombs, escorted from the deck of the Ark Royal, escorted by two Skuses, attacked the Strasbourg at 17.44 (18.44). But they did not achieve hits, but dense and accurate

Anti-aircraft fire shot down one Skua, and two Swordfish were so damaged that they fell into the sea on the way back.

Admiral Somerville decided to give chase on the flagship Hood, the only one that could catch up with the French ship. By 19:00 (20:00) the distance between Hood and Strasbourg was 44,000 m and did not seem to decrease. In an attempt to reduce the speed of the French ship, Somerville ordered the Arc Royal to attack the retreating enemy with torpedo bombers. After 40-50 minutes, the Swordfish carried out two attacks with a very short interval, but all the torpedoes dropped outside the destroyer curtain passed by. The destroyer "Pursuivant" (from Oran) informed the battleship in advance about the sighted torpedoes, and "Strasbourg" each time had time to shift the rudder in time. The chase had to be stopped. Moreover, the destroyers following from the Hood were running out of fuel, the Valiant and Resolution were in a dangerous area without an anti-submarine escort, and there were reports from everywhere that strong detachments of cruisers and destroyers were approaching from Algeria. This meant being drawn into a night battle with superior forces. Compound H returned to Gibraltar on 4 July...

Igor Shumeiko

III AMAZING INQUIRIES And why, in fact, in such detail about this Mers-el-Kebir?

But because it is not only the most significant at sea, but also the most characteristic battle of the Great War. Revealing the essence of this term: England, neither before nor after Mers-el-Kebira, was NOT at war with France. The Big War is a war with the Big Enemy. In which it does not matter at all who is at odds with whom, in peace, in a truce, in marriage. The Big Enemy is Hitler. And for the sake of eliminating even the very possibility of someone's warships hitting him, they must be destroyed.

Like that 381-mm projectile that ricocheted from the Dunkirk tower, flew 2 kilometers and hit the city, every projectile - in this battle - also ricochets on politically correct crucians that condemn Britain, and most of all - Russia for the actions of 1940. Here is the real face of the Great War in Granovsky's stunning description.

. Strasbourg continued to leave at a 25-knot course until an accident occurred in one of the boiler rooms. As a result, five people died, and the speed had to be reduced to 20 knots. After 45 minutes, the damage was repaired, and the ship again brought the speed to 25 knots. Having rounded the southern tip of Sardinia to avoid new clashes with Compound "H", and on 20.10 July 4, "Strasbourg", accompanied by the leaders of "Volta", "Tiger" and "Horrible", came to Toulon.

The Dunkirk was in such a state that Admiral Gensul ordered the damaged ship to leave the fairway and go to the harbor of Saint-Andre. where Fort Saytom and the countryside could provide some protection from British artillery fire. After 3 minutes "Dunkirk" you

World War II. Reboot

fulfilled the order and dropped anchor at a depth of 15 meters. The crew proceeded to inspect the damage.

Turret No. 3 (2-gun 130-mm starboard) was out of order from a fire in the reloading compartment. the servants of which died ... The smoke of tower No. 4 forced during the battle to batten down the bow 130-mm cellars. At about 8 p.m., new explosions occurred in the elevator of tower No. 3.

Fortunately, "Dunkirk" was in the base. Admiral Jensul ordered to stick him aground. Before touching the ground, the shell hole that caused the flooding of several fuel tanks and empty starboard compartments was sealed. The evacuation of unnecessary personnel began, 400 people were left on board to carry out repairs. At about 19:00, the Es Trill and Cotentin tugboats, together with the Ter Neuve and Setus patrol ships, pulled the battleship to the shore, where it ran aground at a depth of 8 meters. Started winding the patch in the places of penetration

skins. After the power supply was fully restored, the hardest work began — the search for and identification of the dead comrades.

On July 4, Admiral Esteva, commander of naval forces in North Africa, issued a communiqué stating that "Dunkirk's damage was minor and would be quickly repaired." This reckless statement provoked a swift response from the Royal Navy. On the evening of July 5, Compound "H" again went to sea, leaving the low-speed "Resolution" in the base. Admiral Somerville decided instead of conducting another artillery battle to act quite modernly - to use planes from the aircraft carrier Ark Royal to attack the Dunkirk, which had landed on the shore. At 05.20 6 July. being 90 miles from Oran. Ark Royal took off 12 Swordfish torpedo bombers escorted by 12 Skua fighters. The torpedoes were set at a speed of 27 knots to a depth of about 4 meters. air defense

Igor Shumeiko

Mers-el-Kebira was not ready to repel the attack at dawn, and only the second wave of aircraft met more intense anti-aircraft fire. This was followed by the intervention of French fighters.

Unfortunately, the commander of the Dunkirk evacuated the servants of anti-aircraft guns ashore, leaving only the personnel of the emergency parties on board. The patrol vessel "Ter Neuve" stood at the side, taking some of the crew members and coffins with the dead on July 3. During this sad procedure, at 06.28 a raid of British aircraft began, which went on the attack in three waves. The two Swordfish of the first wave dropped their torpedoes prematurely, and they exploded on impact without causing any harm. After 9 minutes, the second wave approached, but none of the three dropped torpedoes hit the Dunkirk. But one torpedo hit Ter Neuve, which was just in a hurry to move away from the battleship. The explosion literally tore the small ship in half, and the wreckage of its superstructure showered the Dunkirk. At 0650, another 6 Swordfish appeared with fighter cover. Link. coming from the starboard side, came under strong anti-aircraft fire and was attacked by fighters. Dropped torpedoes again did not reach the target. The last group of three vehicles attacked from the port side. This time two torpedoes rushed towards the "Dunkirk" diagonally from the side of the left krumbol. One hit the Estrel tug, which was located about 70 meters from the battleship, and literally blew it off the surface of the water. The second, apparently with a faulty depth gauge, passed under the keel of the Dunkirk and, hitting the aft part of the wreckage of the TGer Neuve, caused the detonation of forty-two 100-kilogram depth charges, despite the absence of fuses in them. The consequences of the explosion were terrible. A hole about 40 meters long was formed in the starboard plating. Several armor plates of the belt were displaced, and water filled the side protection system. Explosion Force Steel Plate

World War II. Reboot

above the armor belt was torn off and thrown onto the deck, burying several people under it. The anti-torpedo bulkhead was detached from its anchorages for 40 meters, other watertight bulkheads were torn or deformed. There was a strong roll to starboard and the ship settled with its nose so that the water rose above the armor belt. Compartments behind the damaged bulkhead flooded with salt water and liquid fuel. As a result of this attack and the previous battle on the Dunkirk, 210 people were killed.

A temporary plaster was put on the hole, and on August 8, Dunkirk was dragged into free water. Repair work progressed very slowly. And where were the French in a hurry? Only on February 19, 1942, Dunkirk went to sea in complete secrecy. When the workers arrived in the morning, they saw their tools neatly stacked on the embankment and... nothing else. At 23.00 the next day, the ship reached Toulon. carrying on board some scaffolding from Mers el Kebir."

In addition to the excellent work of E. Granovsky, those who wish to receive "confirmation from foreign sources" can refer to the book "War at Sea", the authors: Chester William Nimitz (Admiral of the US Navy, and now, as Mayakovsky would write, "Man and Aircraft Carrier") and Elmer Belmont Potter.

And also to the "Encyclopedia of ships"; this site, \$Hp.65i.5y, appears to be using a translation of the English book Nogu oON.M\$. Nood OesiisNop oR\te EtepsN Eee! a1 Megz E!-Keukhg, Zr4 Lou 1940. Vu Rautaeg \$u6-Neshchepapi Kopa4 S. RAlirz.

This is about the "texture of the main naval battle of the Second World War." But among the "moral political" assessments in the history of the Second World War, you will find dozens like these:

42 Igor Shumeiko

"... In general, these fears (the transition of the French fleet to the Germans) look somewhat far-fetched. Most likely, the reason that made the British so cruelly deal with the former ally, was something else ...

... by defeating the French fleet at Mers-el-Kebir, the British are considered to have created fertile ground for collaborationism in France, not to mention the moral side of the matter."

In fact, my entire book is directed against false political correctness that gives rise to such assessments. The law of the Great War is the only fair criterion for evaluating all the Acts that took place during its period. Those who do not like this "innovation" - the term "Sick War" can be reminded that Hugo Grotius (we will refer to him many more times), who actually developed the "old rules of war", was also perceived as an innovator in his time.

The British at Mers-el-Kebir showed the whole world their determination to fight Nazi Germany to the end. And one more thing — its unbound by the "old" rules of warfare.

And yet ... as the American historian Alistair Horne writes, + ... it was this dramatic attack on the French fleet that most of all convinced Roosevelt of Churchill's (and Great Britain's) intention to continue the war - this is also confirmed by his closest collaborator - Harry Hopkins.

Consider again and again the above evidence. This is the sense in which I previously called the battle of Admiral Somerville one of the most important in World War II. The opinion, the decision of the President of the United States regarding a future war and a future ally, was formed thanks to Mers el-Kebir. The fact that the Great War does not coincide with any dates of signing treaties, declarations of individual, private wars and truces - this just proves

World War II. Reboot

the British destruction of Copenhagen in 1807, and Mers-el-Kebir, but also ... the annexation by the Soviet Union of those three Baltic republics.

Our difference from England is only in that they had to conduct a naval blockade of the Enemy, we had to hold the land front. Notomu and England dealt with "doubtful fleets". and the USSR - "doubtful republics".

But, as it turned out, our ground, front-line mission is doubly difficult. That during the war it is more difficult to hold the front than to conduct naval operations, this is, in general, obvious. But there is also a "post-war heaviness": you can now compare the flow of claims on preventive measures to Britain (for Copenhagen, Mers-el-Kebira) and to us - for the Baltic States ...

The beginning of the Great War, always gradual, approximate, vague, is the period when the Great Enemy is defined. And then, too, the Great War does not depend on all private wars, truces and pacts. And it ends only when this Great Enemy ... Yes, yes, just himself

The fact of the Nuremberg trials, which still causes legal controversy, shows that the end of the Great War is also a special case.

BUT it is precisely for the international situation itself to become "modern", "legal", politically correct, in general, the way it is now – and victory in the Great War is required! First, Strasbourg (the capital of PACE), Prague and Vilnius must be liberated so that those smart people who will tell HOW it was right to release them, and what fines are due for violation of their rules, can settle there again.

Chapter 5 Terminological Crisis

So, in fact, my analytical article was called in Nezavisimaya Gazeta in the issue of October 19, 2001. The date will tell you both the socio-political background of that time and, accordingly, the relational task.

Mesyan after the attack on skyscrapers. "... The world has changed! ... We have entered a new era, an era!...etc." Much has been said about the "terrorist-kamikaze" nature of the opponents, with historical examples.

On this "hot issue" - the modest contribution of my article of that time was in finding the oldest documented mention of "kamikaze". You will be surprised, but this is the Bible, the Book of Maccabees. For the Jews, the exploits of the Maccabees, who restored the kingdom of Judah, are a national shrine. Sports societies "Macabi", etc. But what was the feat of one of the Maccabee brothers? Imagine: a battle that decides the fate of the nation, Tsar Antiochus (the most consistent eradicator of Jewry in history) throws ancient tanks into the attack - battle elephants in armor, with towers for archers ... The only thing that the valiant Romans asked for themselves was - this flight, capitulation before the elephants of Pyrrhus the Great (approximately, by the way, in the same years when Antiochus was withdrawing "his tanks").

World War II. Reboot 45

Further from the First Book of Maccabees, chapter 6, vv. 43-46: "Then Eleazar, (the younger brother of the commander Judas Maccabee) saw that one of the elephants was covered with Nar's armor and surpassed everyone ... and he betrayed himself in order to save the people and acquire an eternal name for himself ... and ran up he under that elephant, and 'killed him, and an elephant fell on him'.

Well, isn't this throw, ripping open the belly of an elephant, not like throwing grenades under a tank? Today SMM reporters would call Maccabeus a kamikaze...

But that article also had a "super task". At that time, President Bush Jr. actively introduced a new term: "rogue states". Interestingly, every American terminological innovation in international law ended in a war. Clinton's "The primacy of human values over the idea of national sovereignty" and the attack on Serbia. "Outcast" - it seems, was the same, quite a "working term". This gave me reason to turn to the founder of most of the modern military legal provisions and terms - Hugo Grotius. And to publish, probably, the most extensive study on this topic in a socio-political, non-special periodical.

Hugo Grotius is a Dutch scientist of the 17th century. Historian and lawyer. Introduced into use the most important idea of "natural law". His "Three Books on the Law of War and Peace" became the basis of military jurisprudence. Until now, all declarations of war and treaties of peace, the Geneva Conventions, etc. — all talks about wars are conducted in his terms. Grotian ideas, including the idea of national sovereignty, became the theoretical basis of the Westphalian Peace Treaties of 1648. Which, in turn, became the starting point of our era.

Grotius investigated the origin of the word "war" - Beyyit. It turns out that in Latin it came from the ancient Roman form: Chielit. What does "fight" mean? Among the Greeks, on the contrary, the word "war", roetosis, came from

46 Igor Shumeiko

"set" (polyphony, multivitamins). That is to say, the Greek wars and strife came from the disintegration (into multitudes).

Thus, the two languages, Latin and Greek, from which almost all the scientific terms of our civilization are taken, deduce, from different angles, the two fathers of war: duel (d4ielot, duel) and multitude (disintegration).

One postulate of Grotius: "it is impossible to kill those persecuted by fate, in particular, those who joined the belligerent side under duress" - waited for its time and was put in the basis of the "Geneva Convention on Prisoners of War". Prisoners of war - called up, forced by the state to conduct military operations - began to be distinguished from mercenaries.

Fundamental and Grotian is the division of wars into: null, private and mixed.

Public are conducted by civil authorities, subjects of public law; private - by persons who do not have civil authority; mixed: on the one hand, the state is fighting, on the other, a private individual.

The last point needs to be understood: a private person can have his own army, the most relevant example of 2001: the United States - Bin Laden.

If anyone remembers, in September 2001, NATO declared a state of war. True, in the column "to whom" there is a unique case, there is a gap. So to speak, "to the bearer."

On "mixed wars" I then, in 2001, gave another set of examples.

The explosion at the ALL "Kursk" and suspicions of another underwater ram as its possible cause caused, among other things, serious publications. In the same Nezavisimaya Gazeta, Rear Admiral Valery Aleksin gave a detailed history of attempts to reach agreements with the Americans on safe navigation and the reasons for the failure of these agreements. He also gave a complete history of all incidents with our and American submarines over the past 45 years. Aleksin also proposed his project of "a more perfect

World War II. Reboot |3

agreements" plus, as a necessary addition, "Protocol on the exchange of experience and cooperation of fleets ...".

Projects of Rear Admiral Aleksin are perhaps the most perfect, detailed (a text with special terminology for half a newspaper page) rules for commanding submarines. That, however, does not exclude an amateurish view of this problem. Vel agreements, peace treaties and non-aggression pacts are signed, ratified for centuries, and it can be seen that in addition to the internal perfection of the agreement, external motives are no less important: "do it or don't do it". And in the most impeccably written agreements, clues, ambiguous interpretations, and vice versa are found. semi-verbal agreements work for a long time.

Let us first pay attention to the peculiarity, the uniqueness of the situation. For decades, the land armies of the USSR and the USA have been coexisting in an balanced and peaceful way. The air forces, for example, in their space incarnation, even cooperate closely. (Soyuz-Apollo cigarettes are already thirteen years old.) And today the general staff officers, presidents in chief and defense ministers visit each other, buffet receptions and briefings are held in Moscow and Briossel. And only the naval forces, the submariners, act almost exactly the same as they would have acted under the conditions of a full-scale declared war. (Nuclear submarine missiles are aimed at strategic targets, and "for each other" under water is only a ram).

Imagine: on the Borodino field, our and the French infantry are fiercely fighting for flushes, and nearby, for example, cavalymen Murat and Uvarov are "brotherlings", arrange joint concerts and presentations. Seems strange...

But this "strangeness" is supported, however, by other examples from naval clashes. I came across an example somehow ... almost humorous.

Throughout the eighteenth century there was a struggle between England and France. Historians sometimes refer to this as the "Second Century

18 Igor Shumeiko

her war", in a figurative sense. That was about a dozen wars, starting with the "War of the Spanish Succession" of 1700-1714 and up to the Napoleonic Wars, moving into the nineteenth century. All these wars ended with correct peace treaties. But if in Europe the states of peace/war were strictly observed, then on distant seas things were going on... And somehow in the West Indies, a French caravan parted ways with the British frigate Dunkirk. Suddenly, shots are fired, cannonballs are flying. The captain of the French - several months on the road - does not know what is there in the capitals. He grabs a mouthpiece: "Hey, on the Dunkirk! Do we have peace or war there?!"

The Briton, also in a shout, shouts to the Frenchman: "Peace! Mir, and without a pause, without even bothering to lower his voice: "Starboard! Pli! »

But after all, even these examples, despite the paradoxical nature, fit perfectly into the "Grotian geometry". In the ocean, in international waters, the captain of a ship becomes a dual figure. He is an object, a military official of the state, he is also a private person (at least until the next session of communication with the earth). His actions are the next sub-section of "the rights of war and peace." The issuance of "letters of marque", how to say, rights to limited piracy, at one time, seems to confirm this.

With the New Outcast you, dear gentlemen!

And already after this brief study of "Grotian" terms, tested for centuries, we can turn to the novelty Made o SZA: rogue states. The term suggests that there is something in common in this list: Libya, Belarus, Serbia. Iraq, Iran, North Korea. The authors insist that the appointment to the "outcasts" is not a whim of the Americans, not a personal antipathy of Bush. But then what? Not all countries on this list have red or green

World War II. Reboot 49

colors on flags, not all presidents wear military uniforms, and not all photographs have brutally menacing facial expressions.

As long as the authors do not give a strict criterion of "outcast", only one indirect, communicative definition can be given. roses! extinguishes. So: a pariah country is outside the intensive global financial, human and commodity exchange. And to be specific: planes (of the leading airlines) don't fly there, payments don't go there (Bar\$c1a5\$ of banks).

And in 2001, I had the opportunity to participate in the organization of one Moscow RE-action (the centenary of the Witte reform and the Kristall factory), which was to be held on September 17th. And now one fragment of the festive program of the holiday had to be canceled - precisely because on September 12, 13, 14 two "payments" did not go through and several necessary people could not fly from New York ...

That is, September 1-14, undoubtedly, objectively, the United States was a "rogue country." As the saying goes, "do not dig another term"...

This concludes this brief historical excursion. The very origin of the term "war" is clarified, the Grotian types of wars and some provisions of his "rights of war and peace" are listed.

The most recent innovations in this area are also indicated: "universal values as a counterbalance to national sovereignty" and "rogue country".

In the next chapter, I will try in some way to outline one very famous, but very false theoretical position, and on the "ruins of it" to propose one new term.

Chapter 6 Direction of the main: strike" von Clausewitz

Yes, it was he, the former colonel of the Russian army, who returned to the Prussian army in 1814 and wrote "On War" to the south, Karl Clausewitz.

Absolutely everyone knows his aphorism from that book: "War is the continuation of politics by other means." Clausewitz was revered by both Lenin (it was in Lenin's retelling that aphorism was known in the territory of "one-sixth"), and Mussolini, who called the translation of "On War" into Italian "... a great, truly fascist book." (In Italy until 1943, "fascist" meant, of course, not a curse, but vice versa).

Instead of Clausewin, I offer the historian Bruce Catton, who wrote: "A distinctive feature of modern warfare is that it itself takes command. Once begun, it urgently demands completion and in the course of action initiates events. rendered beyond human control. Doing, as it seems to them, only what is necessary for victory, people, without noticing it, change the very soil that nourishes the roots of the society.

Only what we called the Great War above is Catton's "Modern Warfare". Let it be

but you don't

World War II. Reboot 51

you may not admit that the whole pathos of Catton is precisely that war is the end of politics.

Yes, in general. Engels also wrote about this, whose reputation may have been tarnished by friendship with another bearded theoretician who made economic forecasts that came true "exactly the opposite." Friedrich Engels, however, had his own independent international authority as a military scientist. The American Encyclopedia also ordered articles for him. And this is what he foresaw in 1887: "For Prussia-Germany, no war is possible, except for a world war. ...it would be a war of unprecedented scale... 8-10 million soldiers will choke each other and at the same time devour Europe to such an extent... the collapse of the old states and their routine wisdom... dozens of crowns are lying around on the pavements, and no one is found to lift them.

What, and is this a "continuation of politics"? Agree. that "the collapse of their routine wisdom" is clearly about old, pre-war political plans.

By the way, the war (World War I) between Russia and Germany continued into 1917. This is what: a "continuation" of the tsarist policy - already renounced. arrested king? ... The war continued, and even in 1918 - what is it: a continuation of the "bourgeois-provisional" policy of the Provisional Government that had fled and Kerensky disguised in women's clothes?

Absolutely everyone considered themselves losers in the First World War — it was the collapse of the whole world Be! Yerde ("Belle Epoque" is a stable designation of about two decades before the First World War. Progress, Congresses...).

And even Trotsky's remark: "Modern wars are waged not with the weapons that the belligerent countries have on the eve of the war, but with the weapons they create in the process of the war itself," somehow indirectly says about the same thing. Modern warfare is always a new reality.

Igor Shumeiko

Now let's turn to the anecdote I gave in the "Munich Chapter" of this book, which describes how ...

Once an Englishman, a Frenchman, a German and an Italian gathered in Munich... and the German immediately announced that his troops would enter the Sudetenland, regardless of the negotiations. And then the Englishman, the Frenchman, the German and the Italian signed an agreement that really "let him in." And the Czech representatives Masaryk and Locatelli (surname) were waiting, indeed, in the hallway. And also a German and an Englishman, in the same place, in Munich (since they have already arrived!) signed a separate agreement, which some corrosive historians call "the actual German-British non-aggression pact"...

It is known that three days before the heroes of the Munich anecdote got together, one of them, a German, received a letter from an American (President Roosevelt) with one very interesting phrase, which, in general, is related to Munich. did not have, but was still a very important phrase, which we will consider in the chapter "The right of a big WAR."

So, Roosevelt-President wrote to Hitler-Fuhrer at that time verbatim the following: "... The social structure of each country involved in the war may collapse." The man was wise. So what is it about: about the "continuation" or about the End of politics?

But maybe there is no truth here at all, and another genius is right - Mao Zedong, who put into circulation the famous slogans: "A rifle gives birth to power" (it's more like a mill with Catton and me), but with a note, it's just as easy, and "The party controls the rifle" 2.

Whom I would not like to resemble most in this chapter is the authors of books, and more often of pamphlets (you must have come across). where Einstein's theory of relativity is refuted "on the fingers". Newton's laws or in general the whole world history. chronology, etc.

World War II. Reboot 53

Of course, I will not undertake here, on 10 printed sheets, to refute the book "On War" by Clausewitz. I simply state that there are other theorists besides Clausewitz, and I will offer you a choice of the most final conclusions of their theories (subject, of course, to conscientious quoting).

According to Clausewitz, war plays a subordinate role in relation to politics, and only politics determines the goals pursued by this or that war, the scale of the war, the amount of effort, etc. Thus, relations are given a purely hierarchical character, when according to - policy is given the role of a higher-hierarchical control element that determines and directs the course of hostilities and the military campaign as a whole.

Here is Clausewitz verbatim: "the thought may arise that politics can put forward demands before the war that it is not able to fulfill; but this hypothesis challenges the natural and unavoidable assumption that politics knows the tool it intends to use."

And here, for example, John Keegan (region Keezap): "... for many societies, war provides more religious, cultural functions than purely political ones." The concept of culture is defined as "shared beliefs, values, associations, myths, taboos, imperatives, customs, traditions, traditions and style of thinking, speech and artistic expression that give stability to any society."

Remember here the role of the Great Patriotic War in our minds, in the education of generations!

In Keegan's assessment, Clausewitz's statement, "of the war as a continuation...etc." - "incomplete, narrow and extremely inconsistent."

Russell Wiggley (Kizze!eveu): "Politics tends to become an instrument of war... war, once started, always tends to generate its own politics. create your own

own momentum

54 Igor Shumeiko

(inertia), to make obsolete the political aims for which it was started by putting forward its own political aims... the dynamics of a military conflict, especially when it tends to move towards total forms, dictates its limits and subjugates politics."

"Total forms" is another of the synonyms, or one of the dimensions of what I conditionally call the "Great War" called. "Total", "modern" (by Engels and Troitsky), folk, domestic (for us), world (for everyone).

And also: "The Great World War" – so, if you look into the periodicals of that era, for a long time, from about 1915 until 1941, they called the First World War. Until they finally realized that the already ongoing Second World War is also a world war.

Martin van Creveld (May uap Steue!4): "If we proceed from the fact that war is a continuation of politics, then we must admit that war is a rational extension of the will of the state, that is, we are dealing with nothing but banal and meaningless cliché. Moreover, if war is an expression of the will of the state, this means that it does not affect other, irrational aspects and motives that affect the war. According to Creveld, Clausewitz describes what the nature of war should be, but not its real nature.

But so far there has been no confirmation in favor of the Clausewitzian postulate in the form of lightning strikes, a voice from heaven ("Listen to this, the truth abides in him!"), You and I are free to choose. True, it is unlikely that the listed John Keegan, Russell Wigley, Martin van Creveld or Bruce Catton (mentioned at the beginning of the chapter) are so famous, and our Karl is a Name, this is a brand that has been promoted, promoted for two centuries, including including Hitler and Mussolini with Lenin.

Yes Yes. And Hitler, on the last day, in the bunker, in his political testament, mentioned him (although maybe completely out of place):

World War II. Reboot

"... With this, from the depths of my heart, I express gratitude to all of you, as my only desire, that you, in spite of everything, do not want to give up the fight, but continue it further against the enemies of the fatherland, no matter where, faithful to the conviction of the great Clausewitz."

In defense of Clausewitz, Peter Paret (Paer Paret!) writes: "... there is a separation from the historical context in which the work was written, and Clausewitz looks "fragmentary and contradictory in his search due to the underdevelopment of our historical consciousness".

It is precisely this good description—"what should be the nature of war"—doesn't that remind you of Tolstoy's famous description of the pre-Austerian council of war?

Weyrother dictates a lengthy and ingenious disposition: "Der erste to the marchrien column... zweitiche to the marchrien column..." — and Napoleon is guaranteed to be destroyed. Here follows someone's timid remark. that the mere advance of the French forward to the Prazenov Heights would immediately change the outcome of the battle—exactly to the opposite. Weyrother looks at the dilettante in amazement: "No, such a nomination is not supposed."

Michel Handel (Mtsvae|Napae!) and a host of other scholars assert: "...it is not our interpretations that have changed, but the very nature of war...your difficulties in understanding Clausewitz are due to the fact that we live in reality. ty. which is qualitatively different from the one in which he lived and worked.

Needless to say, in the "reality in which he lived" Clausewitz, there were no SS, gas chambers, stoves and everything else. However, in fact, he Clausewitz, after all, also participated in the Great War, "Big" - in the sense of the definition offered in this book, in a war of those that she fights on

himself command — and participated. we emphasize, it is very worthy. How can Russia be an officer Clausevin

56 Igor Shumeiko

thank you for one significant episode. In 1812, the downtrodden, intimidated Prussia was forced to expose and subjugate to Napoleon a whole corps that fought with us in the direction of Riga. And the officer of the Russian service Clausewitz, having entered into negotiations with the Prussian corps commander General York, contributed to his transfer to our side (however, this happened at a time ... when Napoleon had long kept poison in his pocket, in case of captivity) ..

But in the manners and mores of the participants in that Great War (with Napoleon), there was still a lot from the influence of humanists, chivalry ... from the same Hugo Grotius. And those elements of novelty, totality that would later develop in the wars of the 20th century — Clausewitz did not see them.

But now we have remembered the Austerlitz Council of War and Tolstoy's sarcasm about "Der erste kolonne marchiren", and it is already difficult to force ourselves to put aside the "War and Peace" taken for verification of quotations. And Vel on the pages of a brilliant novel, by the way, Clausevia himself appeared. True, once and in a moment, but what a moment it is ...

On the night before the Battle of Borodino... Pierre Bezukhov approached Prince Andrei Bolkonsky and was just about to start a conversation, when the hooves of three horses clattered along the road not far from the barn, and, looking in this direction, Prince Andrei recognized Wolzogen with Clausewitz, accompanied by a Cossack. They drove close, continuing to talk, and Pierre and Andrei involuntarily heard the following phrases:

"War (Der krieg....) must be transposed into space (im Raum). This view I cannot praise enough," said one.

- Oda (Oh, ya...)

— Oh. Ya...

"Give them Raum," he repeated, angrily snorting his nose. Prince Andrei, when they passed. It was Raum who left me a father and a son. and sister in the Bald Mountains. That's what it is

World War II. Reboot

I told you, these gentlemen Germans will not win the battle tomorrow, but will only spoil how much their strength will be ... They gave all of Europe to him and came to teach us ...

"So you think tomorrow's battle will be won?" asked Pierre.

"Yes, yes," Prince Andrei said absently. "One thing I would do if I had the power," he began again, "I would not take prisoners. What are prisoners? This is chivalry... If there were no generosity in the war, then we would go only when it is worth it to go to certain death, as now... Then all these Westphalians and Hessians, who are led by Napoleon, would not have gone follow him to Russia, and we would not go to fight in Austria and Prussia, without knowing why. War is not a courtesy, but the most disgusting thing in LIFE ...

It's just hard to interrupt the retelling... By the way, this Wolzogen who clattered past Pierre and Prince Andrei together with Clausewitz is also a genuine, historical character. Wolzogen was General Pfuels' adjutant. And Pfuels was in 1812 the author of the "Russian plan" of the war (Dris camp ... etc.). And earlier he was the author of the plan that ended with the Jeno-Aursted battle and the destruction of Prussia in two weeks...

... looking at Pful, Prince Andrei recalled both General Weyrother and General Mack (who surrendered near Ulm in 1805 and strongly "set up" the Russians) ... and then the author himself, Lev Nikolaevich, steps in after Prince Andrei, in that famous passage : who and how self-confident (English, French, Italian).

"... The German is self-confident worse than anyone, and harder than everyone, and more repulsive than everyone, because he imagines that he knows the truth, a science that he himself invented, but which for him is absolute truth. Such, obviously, was Pful.

And if, after all that has been said, further explanations are required: why did the author take up arms against the late Kluzewitz today?

58 Igor Shumeiko

It is today that human rights defenders and all those who rely on political correctness in the Council of Europe, PACE, Hollywood form stereotypes, draw up claims, nurture generations. If not, there was no Great War with its own right, but it was like this ... "war is a continuation of politics" (and in their minds "war is a continuation of political correctness"), then Russia will always be guilty, the object claims (often official, financial claims). The most glaring example: Lithuania has recently decided on the amount of financial claims against Russia "for occupation". Lithuania, surrendering cities to Hitler, which could have been treated like the fleet in Mers-el-Kebir, but only in the Great War. Which (Great War) - is not, cannot be - "the continuation of politics."

"Big War" in a small kingdom

It is up to the readers to judge, but to illustrate the main theoretical position of my book, I choose examples rather on the principle of originality and entertaining. Perhaps there are some tables and diagrams that also confirm that "war is not a continuation of politics by other means." But it seems to me that in the realm of such not strictly defined concepts as "war" and "politics", the compilation of any chain of formal proofs can result in an endless dispute about terms. Therefore, one original and expressive fact, it seems to me, will be more convincing. Therefore ... we continue to pick out the raisins from the buns of history.

Actually, the following example is one short and bright quotation, but, unfortunately, it requires not very short and. most likely, not such bright my explanations.

Winston Churchill in his "History of the English-speaking peoples" (A No. 1\$10ru op She En? 1\$B-5reaKshe Reor[\$, 4 vols.

World War II. Reboot 59

MU 1956-1958) gives this introduction to the story of the Second English Civil War:

"The alignment of forces in the Second Civil War was utterly simple. King, Lords and Commons, landlords and merchants, city and peasantry, bishops and presbyters, the Scottish army and the British navy, all opposed the New Model Army. And the army coped with everything."

The following explanations are required here. The "alignment of forces" in the First Civil War (1642-1646) was, on the contrary, extremely complex. It can be said that about ten different subjects fought, signed a truce and went from one side to another. Quite roughly, it went like this:

The aristocracy, the peasantry, the Anglican episcopate, the North and the West of the country were in favor of the king. The middle class, the merchants, the navy, the Center, the South, London are for Parliament.

The Irish, the Scottish Presbyterians were changing the front line.

Parliament, from one side - "against the king" - split, and the parties to the conflict became some.

And in the midst of this complex political turmoil, Cromwell (by order of Parliament) gradually formed a "new model" army.

And when the Parliamentary (English) Presbyterians passed a law to dissolve the army in 1648, the army did not comply with the new model, and ... see further above.

Woton, the logic of the Great War. For six years, since 1642, there has been a "political war". The "army of the new model" was thus, according to Clausewitz, "another means of continuing politics." But one day the quantitative growth of her (new army) moshi turned into a new quality, and ... the war continued on its own. All the politicians, the former enemies, all the actors of the First War, gather on one side. On the opposite - the former "other environment

Igor Shumeiko

property" of one of them. And... Churchill undoubtedly feels this paradox, which allows him to build such an elegant phrase.

The civil war also sometimes takes command

Whose indignation and even amazement I understand so well is the amazement and indignation of the heroes of our Revolution and Civil War somewhere in the early thirties. For brevity, we personify them, imagine, for example. Zinoviev.

Behind such years... I walked waist-deep in blood, grabbed and shot thousands of hostages. But the White Guards also stood five kilometers from the Northern Labor Commune (as St. Petersburg was called at one time), they were five minutes from the capture and uplifting of the leader of the Comintern ...

And now, finally, silence and peace... the country is working. The power is saved. Material goods are now distributed in proportion to the risks experienced... From the city of Zinovyevsk (formerly Yelizavetgrad), labor reports, greetings and gifts are sent to each glorious date... In terms of the level of "liberalization" of the USSR in the 1920s, it was approximately equal to Russia. these 90s. Free entry and exit, foreigners walk. the currency is convertible — change it and go see Europe. NEP. In the CPSU(b) - legal platforms and factions, discussion of various programs, almost in parliamentary forms. "Joint ventures" with Western firms, concessions. The army was reduced by 10 times and transferred to the extremely economical territorial-militia principle of recruitment, because it was a complete victory ... It seems that they sat out ... And suddenly, 5-7 years later, somehow everything again ... Some kind of "aggravation class struggle", where "wreckers" came from SOMETHING, again executions, and more and more often – executions of "winners". No logic!

World War II. Reboot

In Russia, during the First Civil War, the balance of power was also complicated: whites, reds, greens, chieftains, interventionists, socialist-revolutionaries, monarchists. In the CPSU(b) there are several groupings. The "siloviki" are grouped around three Nentres: the Headquarters of the Workers' and Peasants' Red Army, the Revolutionary Military Council, and the Cheka. The Red Army as a whole did not become the main novelty, a phenomenon, the key to victory, like the armies of the French and English revolutions. (In order not to argue here for a long time, let us simply recall: the Cromwellian "new model" conquered Ireland, the French - in general, half of Europe. The Red Army - failed in Polyshnia). It seems that for a number of reasons, the main phenomenon, the main factor in the Victory in our First Civil War was not the army, but the "new model police", the Cheka. Although it then remained only one of the power structures, but under the head of the completely loyal Dzerzhinsky.

But our Civil War also takes command of itself. The "new model police" suddenly slips out of the hands of two unconditional political leaders of the country since 1917: the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars and the Chairman of the Revolutionary Military Council, chooses the head of a third-rate structure (the Secretariat of the Central Committee) as his leader, and brings the Civil War to a logical (total) level. end...

To paraphrase Churchill, we can say:

... The surviving Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, the Trotskyists, the workers' opposition, the Decists, the trade unions, the Zinovievists, the kulaks, the military specialists, the Ryumin and Rykov groups, the Bukharinites, the Workers' and Peasants' Red Army - all came out against the New Model Police.

And the "Police" coped with everything.

Chapter 7: The Mstoric's Debate with Rezun

It is well known that today in Russian military historiography the main dispute revolves around the idea "thrown in" by Suvorov-Rezun:

The USSR was planning an attack on Germany, and Hitler preempted Stalin by literally 2 weeks (the "Suvorov" date of Stalin's offensive was July 6, 1941).

The language of Suvorov-Rezun is bright, emotional, and these arguments are often found in places "where the foot of a popular historian has never set foot before," and they are always presented clearly and seemingly convincingly. The support of many Western media is also on his side. Here is a review in the preface to Icebreaker: "Viktor Suvorov's opinion in the field of defense is becoming public opinion. He shapes it." International Defense Review, Geneva, September 1989.

But real historians, Russian patriots find There are now no less convincing counterarguments. proving that the USSR was planning a defensive war against Germany. For example, Alexei Isaev. Andrey Zorin, Oleg Tishkov operate with serious facts and are not inferior to Rezun in emotional persuasiveness.

I don't want to be like a magician. I believe (and I will try to prove it) that on one issue

World War II. Reboot |6

su, the main thing in this book, both points of view are generally correct, and most importantly ... quite patriotic. Yes, yes, it is terrible to pronounce. but the defector, traitor, anti-adviser Rezun's main historical thesis is by no means anti-Soviet.

The mechanics of this focus is simple. Take the two options under discussion:

1. The USSR planned to defend itself against Germany.
2. The USSR planned to attack Germany.

Add a third option (tested for that momate by the whole of Europe!):

3. The USSR planned to go over to the side of Germany.

Then combine the first two options (because what to defend, what to attack-fight), and you will get:

1. The USSR planned to fight Germany. 2. The USSR planned to go over to the side of Germany.

Of course, everyone perfectly understands that there could be no question of crossing over according to the "Czech model" ("preemptive capitulation"), but enough transition models were tested at that time: on the fact of crossing the border (Denmark), on the fact of the bombing (Netherlands), on the fact of airborne landings (Norway), on the fact of a real threat to the capital (France), on the fact of finding common geopolitical goals (Finland, Hungary, Romania). Now let us assume that "that very pact" is really a prologue to the transition to the Nazi camp (which the USSR is often blamed for), and not to a fierce struggle ...

AMAZING REQUESTS And who, in fact, is right, Rezun or the anti-resunists?

Igor Shumeiko

But after all, any General Staff is obliged to plan, calculate, work out all the strategic options simultaneously. And the defense in the general staffs of all European powers was considered as temporary, forced, as preparation for an offensive. Alexey Isaev in Antisuovorov writes:

"... Behind the scenes (for Rezun) the question remained, who had them defensive? All war plans of the major powers participating in the two world wars of the twentieth century were offensive. Moreover, the offensive nature did not depend on who would be the initiator of the war. For military planning, this was absolutely indifferent; the plans did not consider the question of the order in which war was declared.

Only the plans of small countries were defensive, the main line of planning in this case was a stubborn defense in the hope that powerful allies would crush the opponents who attacked the dwarf country.

And if the dilemma – to fight or go over to the side of the enemy – is resolved as "to fight", then there is nothing fundamentally mutually exclusive in the sets of "attacking" and "defensive" measures.

And most importantly! Agree that with such a formulation of the question, both Rezunov's and anti-Rezunov's arguments are essentially patriotic. One found a hundred proofs of a plan for a formidable attack through Romania and Hungary against the Reich. Another found a hundred proofs that it was planned to stand to the death on the "Stalin Line". So, in total, two hundred proofs were found that the USSR did not plan to transfer its potential to Hitler!

... And here are the objections to the reality of the "option of not going over to the side of Hitler"... Oh, this is such a contradictory k.1bok truly heroic and unbearably vile, which, really, you think for a long time before taking it into your hands.

World War II. Reboot

1. Argument of historians, diplomats: "Always, in all coalitions, all participating states scared each other with the possibility of a separate peace." Playing the card of the threat of a separate peace is more often an element of pressure on the allies, and here it is still very far from the implementation of such

foot step...

2. An objection, for example, from a Leningrader or a Stalinist radiant of 1942: "Yes, it's impossible at all to live under the Nazis."

3. The argument of the "united European" of 1942 (or 2002 goals). "Well, although we are not Germans, we are culturally closer, more economically integrated and useful. So Hitler found a job for us (that's why blowing up power plants - no, no, otherwise the quarries in Thuringia shine). And those are the Scythians, they are threatened with complete annihilation, even if they fight to the death."

Of these three, of course, the "pleasant" one is to talk to the third.

- Monsieur (pan), your design bureaus and factories are, of course, wonderful, Renault and Skoda are wonderful cars, but in terms of a purely theoretical comparison of the needs of your former manager Adolf, the T-34 tanks were much better for him. more interesting and necessary thing. Capturing them on the battlefield (this happened, yes, and often), the Germans dismantled and tried to copy them (unsuccessfully), let their selected crews fight on them. And of course, the Ural factories that produce them, and the Kirovsky (KV-2), would be much more desirable objects for your Adolf. Not to mention those nameless "numbered" factories - manufacturers of Katyushas and -2.

And as for racial and cultural proximity as a guarantee against Auschwitz ... The Fuhrer was generally strange. fantastic personality. X artist. It is possible to comprehend the racial type of any people only by seeing (here he is right) its true representatives: peasants and peasant de

Igor Shumeiko

tei. That is why Hitler did not attach decisive importance to the impressions of the Viennese kaleidoscope of his youth (regulars of salons, pubs, "furniture houses"). And he repeated phrases like: "The Alsatian peasant is an extremely racially pure being. What the Alsatian peasant thinks and does is extremely important." In World War I, Hitler fought on the Western Front. That is why he was so shocked (no less than Stalingrad) when he first saw white-headed Russian children near Vinninets. "Yes, they are big Aryans. than us! ", he confessed to his comrades-in-arms, dejectedly. True (the Fuhrer is the Fuhrer!), having studied this issue with all the meticulousness, he nevertheless found that "... by the age of 14, the Aryan type nevertheless shows through more strongly in German children."

That is, the "Aryan championship": the Russian children's team won, and the youth team lost (under the sole refereeing of the Fuhrer). So your bizarre Fuhrer could instantly and in the most striking way change the "rating" of any European ... contingent.

However, no, he also had one indelible "racial impression" taken from school. In Table Talk, he recalls: "In our class, the little Czechs wept—on the day the news came of the fall of Port Arthur. And since then I have fallen in love with Japan!"

An interesting psychological sketch. Lousy, oneshe io Russia, knowing nothing. but he fell in love with Japan - not as the conqueror of Port Arthur, but as a punishment for the "little Czechs" who beat him at school. And then an important conclusion – into the outstretched ears of the "table" generals surrounding him: "The Czechs will always hope for "Mother Russia! "...

If only... In 1938!

AMATEUR INQUIRIES But after all, Rezun in the Icebreaker writes not only about the Etelian plan of attack in 194, but also ...?

World War II. Reboot 67

Yes Yes. Exactly ... Rezun still writes that Stalin almost himself put Hitler in a cannibal chair. But this is already a completely "special article". Both the Icebreaker and all other military-political texts of Rezun definitely fall into two parts, relatively speaking, military and political. This is not a play on words. The watershed line is so objective, it can be traced even in the very texture of the text. as if under one "label" they tried to "solder" completely dissimilar materials: steel and plywood, for example. "Military" Rezun, "the soul is empty, the brain is full of numbers of divisions", in general. is quite adequate to one narrow topic - the proof that Stalin in 1941 planned to attack (or counterattack?) Hitler. Here he (Rezun) is a tireless weaver, and his canvas, his own network of proofs are strong. Hundreds. thousands of examples, only "his" warehouses of cowhide boots on the border in the 68th and 41st are worth something! Here are all his "division numbers in the brain." But the "political" Rezun, who is trying to blame Stalin for Hitler's coming to power, is not a dense fabric, but a couple of rotten threads. It is wild and ridiculous to build an "evidence base" on Trotsky's support: "Oh, if there were no Stalin, there would be no Hitler, there would be no Gestapo! " Yes

even if it was Rezun the schoolboy who wrote the essay, he could be scolded: "There are quotations of evidence, but there are pitations - as if sighs."

Here is the shortest quote from the Chief of the German General Staff Halder: '<... but the Fuhrer's continental thinking...' is an indirect, completely unexpected evidence. This is a proof quote... It was about many variants of the colonies proposed to Hitler, so to speak, "African and Asian Munich ideas". And Halder sighs that the Fuhrer's continental thinking did not allow him to seriously even consider such proposals. All thoughts are about the continent, about Eurasia, that is, about the Soviet territories. Wars in the West - except for the necessary provision of the Main War - in the East.

-

Igor Shumeiko

I must confess: I myself added the word "ah" to the "basic Rezunov quote from Trotsky" myself, to complete the picture, but it is also clear that this is a type of sigh. Husband to a hateful wife: "Ah! If not, I could become a professor, an academician! And vice versa: "Oh, if not, I could marry ... a millionaire! Trotsky even has this appendage with the first everyday detail that comes across: "... and the Gestapo would not exist! "- confirms the psychological drawing. Why Gestapo? not SS, not SD2?... And it's like: "<... ah! neither you nor your ... dirty socks! »

Building a base on such emotional "oh, if only" of a wife expelled to Mexico (or a "political prostitute", according to another well-known definition) is simply bad form. And the entire Rezunov political part is a few more of the same quotes from Tronkoy in 1936, 1938 and 1939. "Stalin finally untied the hands of Hitler, as well as his opponents, and pushed Europe to war" (November 1938). "The USSR will move with its whole mass to the borders of Germany just at the moment when the Third Reich will be involved in the struggle for the redivision of the world" (June 1939). And all THESE "most secret information", all these "hot reports" are from the homeland of tequila, where it has been sitting for more than ten years. as retired, Trotsky.

If you don't feel sorry for 35 rubles, find the Icebreaker near the metro and make sure. Better yet, check the Internet.

And I would advise our historians to pay attention: Rezun really tirelessly rummages through the military archives, sensitively finds facts that are out of sight of many, and deftly presents them. It must be admitted that he, Rezun, figuratively speaking, brought a whole new army of readers to the former battlefields of World War II. But his "historical" books are not competitors for the serious works of the same Isaev. He is among Coelho, Dan Brown, Dontsova. Koretsky, Tolkien. That is, when a person chooses to read: about bandits, alchemists, prostitutes, artists — or "about the war".

World War II. Reboot

So, we just need a different model of using Rezun. For example, a man releases a pig into a truffle field, the pig first searches, then tears off the truffles, but this is where its "cooperation" ends. A person finds another use for the truffle, different from the desires of his grunting "colleague".

If we are involved in the emergence of a new Big Enemy in Europe (with unsuccessful instructions to the German communists), then it is, as it were, at the philosophical level of "the interconnectedness of all that exists" and approximately to the same extent as Polysha, Mexico, Malta, Tibet, Guadeloupe...

"The Coming of Hitler" is three steps, approximately equal in meaning:

1} victory of the NSDAP in the parliamentary elections,

2) the appointment by President Hindenburg on January 30, 1933 of Hitler as Chancellor,

3) the death of Hindenburg on August 2, 1934, and the decision that preceded it by a few days. that in the event of this death, the caniler would become president.

And then Hitler carried out yet another state casting: while retaining the post of Chancellor, he appropriated the title of Fuhrer to himself, and canceled the post of Reich President. And he introduced a provision that all army officers without exception were obliged to swear allegiance, but not to the constitution, but to the Fuhrer, that is, personally to Adolf Hitler.

Now back to those three steps up.

1) In the parliamentary elections, indeed, Hitler was helped by the unwillingness of the socialists and communists to unite. Rezun here for a long time procrastinates the name of the communist Remmele, about whom it finally turns out only that "he was an ardent admirer of Stalin." Nightmare revelation. But after all, even throughout Europe, the socialists very difficultly and rarely converged with the communists. This is how they are conceived, and they have different "Internationals" (Second and Third).

20 Igor Shumeiko

2) We must not forget that President Hindenburg appointed the Chancellor anyway, sometimes in accordance with parliamentary dispositions, and sometimes not. Only in 1932 he, Hindenburg. On March 28, he appointed Heinrich Brüning, who formed the government and resigned on May 30 (at the request of Hindenburg, in what follows, for brevity, we will write: "dismissed by Hindenburg.")

3) Next, | Franz von Papen was appointed kaizler on June 17th. Further, on December 3, von Schleicher was appointed - dismissed on January 30, 1933. Next, appointed Hitler.

Hindenburg was an absolute and indisputable figure in Germany, and why did he become one? Here is an example for you at the level of "the interconnection of everything that exists": the Russians really made Hindenburg such, M-M ... "quasi-Kaiser" (forgive me this term), because they allowed themselves to be defeated near Tannenberg. This victory of Hindenburg in 1914 (and practically on the site of the historical Grunwald, where 500 years earlier the Teutons were defeated by the Polish-Lithuanian-Russian army) saved Germany and gave him such prestige and glory that... But if unwind further, then Hindenburg won because the Russians did not mobilize and, in violation of all plans, threw forward and alone the armies of Rennenkampf and Samsonov - at the passionate French pleas, saving Paris and partly saving it (the Germans transferred to Eastern Prussian troops, which they did not have enough to implement the Schlieffen Plan) ... Here they are, the true lines of force of interrelations in world history.

BUT, even just to imagine an old-school field marshal, the majestic Prussian Hindenburg, consulting with Stalin on the appointment of his cannibals, this ... this must be retreated for a thousand years. rewrite and distort the entire history of the world. the entire chronology. to call Fomenko with Nosovsky - and that, perhaps, you can't imagine such a thing.

World War II. Reboot |6 _

This is what Hitler fundamentally differed from all three previous cannibals of 1932, because he had his own army, even two: Ernst Röhm's SA detachments (this is almost completely his own guard), and the Steel Helmet detachments (Reichswehr veterans, "master" - Alfred Hugenberg, capitalist, one of the richest people in Germany).

A feature of the political life of Germany in those years: many parties had their own semi-combat units. And the communists, and even the socialists (yes, they had "green shirts"). Such was, in modern terms, the "dress code"... By the way, Hitler's well-known phrase "Whoever is the boss on the street is the boss in Germany" is exactly about THAT "romance" of street brawls, breakdowns of strangers and protection of their rallies. So, Hitler became the master on the street. when multi-millionaire Hugenberg agreed to join his Brownshirts, the SA, to join his

"Stalnovlemovites". This happened about the same day when ex-Killer Papen, together with Thyssen and Krupp, asked Hindenburg for Hitler.

The Communists (even if they are recognized as 100% Stalinists) were the furthest from these combinations; moreover, they were the target and the main victim of the parties negotiating in the Hindenburg's waiting room.

The book "Daily Life in Berlin under Hitler", authored by Jean Marabini, is good precisely because of its "non-dissertation". There is no cross-cutting theory in it, but there are several hundred micro-testimonies of politicians and "little people", diplomats and correspondents of Western newspapers in Germany. The author seemed to be walking with a voice recorder through the streets of Berlin in the thirties. And he testifies: in 1932 even German Jews(') were more afraid of the Communists than of Hitler (German Jews were 90% wealthy people).

An example of real help to Hitler, recognized by historians all over the world, is his actual rescue by the "Munich" at the moment of the most real threat of losing power...

Igor Shumeiko

Military cooperation between the USSR and Germany (another Rezunov item)? But this is just the 20s. With the advent of Hitler, the intensity of joint work decreased. After the pact. of course the other way around. increased significantly, but this is different, this is a maneuver. to which the person who took up the Great War is entitled, the real components of which at that time were: Spain, Hassan, and Khalkhin Gol.

To be honest, the previous two pages of the book made me a little uncomfortable. It is embarrassing to state such banal truths. But still, in conclusion, for those, for example, who at this point have read only ... Rezun and Dan Brown. And such an informed historian as Churchill, who wrote his memoirs during the period of the most cruel confrontation with the USSR, never once accused Stalin of having Hitler come to power.

I repeat that in the broadest sense, the situation in Germany was influenced not only by the USSR, but also by Greece, Tibet, Mexico, Honduras, Malta... The whole world... And... Sweden, quiet Sweden.

One thing is usually repeated about the Swedish-Hitler ties: Swedish iron ore. Yes, Kiruna ore was the basis of German metallurgy. The Germans, so adored by the epithet "steel", steel - by origin - had Swedish. And if you trace that difficult path with some "tagged atom", it turns out that the fragments and bullets that war veterans in Russia, Britain, and the USA still carry in themselves, used to lie under a mountain ... far, far away, in the very north of Sweden.

We can say: they sold ore, business is business. It can be said that they paid off with uninterrupted supplies from a possible invasion by Hitler. The Fuhrer had such a plan - the development of the same General Falkenhorst, the conqueror of Norway and Denmark. And it did not materialize, perhaps because of "not seeking good from good." Now the ore is coming - pah-pah! - and in case ... di

World War II. Reboot

versions of the Resistance, and the bombing of the British. If you look at the map, the exit from Kiruna is one thin line of a single railroad. This is not the dense network of roads in Germany, which, no matter how many bombs they were, worked until May 1945. Kiruna could be cut off with one airstrike. But the Swedish "neutrality" turned out to be the best anti-aircraft defense of the Reich's supply routes.

And if we move on from the real, material world (even if it was such a material beloved by the Nazis as steel), then it turns out that in the world of ideas, Sweden was connected with Germany.

The great traveler, scientist and writer Sven Anders Gedin is one of Hitler's main idols. A truly noble man, he wished for peace in Europe and, like many, considered the Fuhrer a true peacemaker. He openly repeated that he himself was a quarter Jew. In addition, he was a great friend of Russia. (And here Rezun could have exposed "in an icebreaking way": the USSR and Hitler "were friends through Hedin ... and for sure ... agreed"). The Reich Chancellor was always happy to have long conversations with the Swede. It was Sven Gedin who opened the 1936 Olympic Games in Berlin.

Hermann Goering saw the swastika for the first time in his life in Sweden at the von Rosenow castle. The first institute of racial biology in Europe was opened in 1921, in the "Swedish Oxford", Uppsala, and it was a project of the then ruling Social Democratic Party. Another of the Swedish analogues or even anticipations, the antecedents of similar measures in Germany is a general account of the Jews of Sweden. But those lists were not required ... It turns out, ore. iron ore saved the Swedish Jews... Yes, here is another example of "interconnection and mutual influence of all that exists." In Sweden, detachments of the "Northern Youth" – "Nordisk Ungdum" were also created, and also earlier than the Hitler Youth . By the way, Ingvar Kamprad also marched in the Northern Youth, later the founder of the IKEA worldwide network (I have an idea!).

Igor Shumeiko

According to journalist Bosse Sean. 500 Swedish volunteers fought in the SS, in the Viking and Norland divisions. Privates there received 311 kroons per month, sergeants 563 kroons, captain 1200. The average salary in Sweden at that time was 270 kroons. One of these Swedish SS men was even a witness at the wedding of Adolf Hitler and Eva Braun. And, concluding with the marriage theme, let us also remember Goering, who met in Sweden the "love of life" Karina von Cannow...

This is Sweden. It could be written, in modern terms, as "associate members" of United (Hitler) Europe. Maybe it will seem to someone that the facts of her complicity in the "fascist project" are somehow mounted, reduced for exaggeration, "protrusion" of her, Swedish, share of guilt and responsibility. No, I repeat, the whole point of this book is to point out exactly the similarity of situations in all (except Britain and the USSR) countries of Europe, and the complete similarity of their decisions. "We value and protect our material culture. We are not fanatics. Someone else will have to donate their property and set us free."

So take it as evidence "by the contrary": the author does not intend to "push out the complicity" of a quiet, quiet Sweden, so that behind this "bloated example" some kind of "quiet, quiet Holland" does not hide ... And here , by the way, an example of "Dutch complicity". turned up quite by accident, without any purposeful "search for evidence."

One of the heaviest air battles of 1944 in the Baltic. German aviation, based mainly in Kotka (Finland), keeps our fleet in the Gulf of Finland locked up like in a bottle. (In general, the neutralization of significant naval forces exclusively by aviation is one of the main German "know-how" of that war.) Our pilots have been trying for a long time to break through this blockade;

World War II. Reboot

the base of the Luftwaffe is the air defense cruiser Niobe. 7 of our air regiments, 132 aircraft were thrown into the decisive battle. As a result, the Niobe was nevertheless sunk, the Luftwaffe was thrown back from the Gulf of Finland. Two of our pilots received the Hero of the Soviet Union that day. And at the end of the dramatic description of the nagn, the author briefly mentions that the famous Niobe is the former Dutch cruiser Gelderland ...

And how many such examples of the real complicity of the "United Europe" can certainly be found in the annals of the Second World War!

The Dutch history of the war mentions attempts to defend themselves, crossed out by the "brutal bombardment of Rotterdam." There is also the phrase "... but the forces turned out to be too unequal", which in

combined with the fact that Hitler, attacking Belgium and France, allocated only 16,000 soldiers to Holland, leaves. certainly an interesting impression.

In fairness, it must be said, summing up the topic of "influence", that Rezun has not yet spoken out on it before the contest. "How Stalin created Hitler, how he helped him seize power and strengthen himself is a separate big topic. I am preparing a book on this subject," he writes. That is, there will be "more quotes." True, he has not been able to fulfill this promise for almost 15 years. Has Trotsky's Mexican pronouncements come to an end? What do you recommend? Except... the film was recently released - "Frida". About the famous artist. Mexican revolutionary, fighting friend and mistress of Leon Trotsky - Frida Kahlo. If the political reviews "Looking from Mexico" became so important in revealing the theme of Hitler's rise to power, just like the BBC's "Looking from London". Maybe look in the film for supporting quotes? The action there takes place precisely in 1939-1940, during which time the testimonies of the Trinity have already been so successfully used in Le

76 Igor Shumeiko

till the end." Maybe "Frida Kahlo" will add something, like: "Oh, if not for Stalin, my Levik would be a purely second Lenin! Second Napoleon" Frida, like Trotsky at that time, was "in the midst of historical, revolutionary events", but, more importantly, Frida Kahlo today is a very "hyped" person (perhaps even more than Trotsky), her Salma Hayek herself plays the film! (And they dreamed of playing it, even begged the film director Madonna and Jennifer Lopez about it!) For a pop book, it will be easy - in the top ten, any advertiser and PR person will confirm this. When the cover will say: "Sensational news about the secret causes of the Second World War! As Frida Kahlo said, Trotsky said that Stalin set Hitler on fire.

And the preface to the Icebreaker was written by Bukovsky, if you remember this one. Equal to Luis Corvalan during one barter operation, and then even more elevated by the cumulative Western PR, to fantastic quotes, he will surely explain to Rezun the importance of "information occasions", the importance of any links to big names, U1R to persons. At least in this form: "The last revelations of Jennifer Lopez! The famous mega-star claims: "Frida Kahlo, whose secret diaries I read when I was about to play her role in the blockbuster of the same name, testifies irrefutably: Hitler was just a pawn in the cunning hands of Stalin!" "

Two Vova historians (Bukovsky and Rezun)

Some chapters of my book are supplemented by portraits of the persons mentioned. And as we approached the end of this chapter, a certain painful feeling grew in me. It seems that's what's going on here. The duty of a historian, or, say, a pamphleteer, is to push the subject to the limit. Having refuted the version that seems to me false, it is necessary to

World War II. Reboot —^ |

what to say about the authors. Biographical and psychological background and all that...

And now, mentally going through some facts, arguments, you suddenly realize the complete hopelessness, the impossibility of conducting any dispute, describing the features of these persons. (The visual image of this effort is like an attempt to cut through a puddle of some kind of mud with a whip.) You understand that the point is precisely in the absence of persons. Before you is just... talking (champing) dirt... Let me explain, by the way, why we are talking about the author of "Icebreaker" and the author of the preface to "Icebreaker". It seems that things are incomparable, even in terms of volume. But such an idea just comes from real books, with real authors, with real arguments, with real topics for debate.

Here, however, there is complete hopelessness in that everything is obscured by these formless and dimensionless (and meaningless) definitions: "dissident", "victim of the regime". And it becomes completely

It doesn't matter who fled, who was bartered, who wrote a book (1000 pages), who is just a preface (5 pages).

But still (we'll have to) - let's plunge into ... let's say, into Bukovsky.

"It's funny to remember now, but in those distant years, anti-communism, and simply a negative attitude towards the Soviet Union, was like a bad disease in the eyes of the Western intelligentsia, and an honest everyday writer of inveterate socialism could not count on the recognition of his talent, but also just for a review. Only a few of us had by that time succeeded in making a breach in wall of silence.

It was even more difficult for Victor than for Pam. After all, even to me, some left-wing scum in one television dispute dared to hint that. they say, "some people" may regard my views as "a betrayal of their country". But That was once, and with my biography, it was easy for me to get rid of that dirty trick. From the very beginning, he had to live with this senseless stigma..."

78 Igor Shumeiko

And moving from "pitiful" to "logic"...

"... The victory of the revolution in Russia was, in the words of Lenin, "less than half the battle." For this victory to become final and irrevocable, "we must achieve the victory of the proletarian revolution in all, or at least in several of the main capitalist countries." Without their industrial potential there was nothing to think about socialism. Hence the Leninist NEP, and the new tactics of "siege of the capitalist citadel", using their contradictions to hasten the advent of the world revolution. that is, the beginning of the world war. Stalin in this sense was just a faithful disciple of Marx-Lenin.

I can explain. The whole, absolutely the whole logical chain of Rezun comes down to the following. Something indisputable, banal is taken, like: \$1 U15 rises - raga Bet {if you want peace, prepare for war). And then the chain continues: Was Stalin preparing for war? — Yes, how! (hereinafter - 130 pages of solid, in general, evidence). "So, it means that he also appointed Hitler to the chancellors of Germany - so that he had someone to fight with! "(And about this another 5 pages, those same ones with "fresh" quotes from Trotsky in 1939).

So is Bukovsky: Was Stalin a faithful disciple of Marx-Lenin? Yes! Does Marx have a thesis about the inevitability of world revolution? Yes! Is a world revolution essentially a world war? Right. Well, Stalin and ...

For such syllogisms, 150 pages and two paragraphs are indeed sufficient. But after that, Volodya needs to explain to the reader why in real books, real historians (Churchill, for example), there is no trace of such "logic on the fingers." A little more Bukovsky:

"In a word, it is clear that our domestic historians could not in any way recognize the facts set forth in this book without recognizing the natural aggressiveness of communism and its responsibility in a crime against humanity on a par with Hitlerism. But what prevented Western historians from noticing such an obvious truth?

— ..

World War II. Reboot

Yes, exactly the same as their Soviet counterparts: conformism. After all, here in Xanadu. There are powerful political forces that are capable of making deeply unhappy any wise guy who comes out with revelations they don't like. To admit, following the famous anecdote, that Hitler was just a "petty tyrant of the Stalin era", the local establishment is still not ready now, and until recently the author of such a theory would have been ostracized as a "fascist".

No career to make. such a daredevil could never become a professor, or even publish a book. That is why in the West there were not much more people who decided to openly declare themselves anti-communists than in the former USSR."

Just imagine: "Churchill is a conformist! » In fact, it's hard to even imagine anything more incompatible. (Like, hmm... "Kolobok Rezun ran not from the GRU, but from the Bolshoi Ballet"). The most talented, and certainly certainly the most well-informed chronicler, Churchill was a minister until he received the premiership in 1940. And, what is essential, he writes his history not at the moment of friendship-alliance with Stalin. between Tehran and Yalta. and in the midst of the Cold War with the USSR. declared in part by him. And even close, Churchill does not consider Stalin (or the German communists) to be the culprits of Hitler's coming to power. Ah, well then, then Churchill is a "conformist"!

And in everything in Bukovsky, the logic of a person who received a position at Cambridge precisely "for pure dissidence" is very noticeable. Who well understands the vulnerability of his position: both the "barter deal: Korvalan-Bukovsky" and his Cambridge "feeding" are just the smallest curls of a sick historical pattern. Well, he turned up as an accidental living illustration for some keynote report on <... the communist threat and the need to support dissidence"... but after all

Zo Igor Shumeiko

everything can change in one minute... "After all, even here, in the West, there are powerful political forces that are capable of making deeply unhappy any wise guy who comes out with revelations they don't like." Here is the image chosen for himself: a wise guy who can be made deeply unhappy, a kind of ... Akaky Akakievich Goebbels.

And another historian Vova, who littered a certain part of the shelves of our book stalls, recently, on his approximately 15th-16th book, undertook a new marketing ploy: "I take my words back!" I had to, I looked in, read a few pages - it looks like yes: Rezun will really sell the next 10-15 books under the sauce of partial self-refutations. He has already apologized to Marshal Zhukov. But on the most important (in my opinion) topic of his "icebreaking" stretches: Hitler against Stalin (and in fact - blaming the USSR for the Second World War) - there are no self-denials here ... In general, it's funny: the new Judas is not hangs himself, but only diligently adds to the thirty yeses and the 31st - 35th pieces of silver - for his "Memories of the Garden of Gethsemane." And then also the 36th - 40th piece of silver - for "Amendments to Memoirs about ... I take my words back! »

And any conversation will inevitably move into this plane, according to the law of the spreading of a semi-liquid substance. Therefore, we will finish with the "Vovchik-historians". And let's move on to the historian - from self-real.

Chapter 8 Too Many Churchills

It is no longer known which of the journalists launched this slogan, but in 1915 it was picked up by many British newspapers. Minister of the Navy in 1911-1915, Churchill had a lot of merit for the country (including the energetic transition of the fleet from coal to oil), but in January 1915 he got involved in a long landing operation near the Dardanelles.

It seems that the Russians were confidently crushing the Turks in the Caucasus, and no one expected that the British landing on the Gallipoli peninsula, near the Dardanelles, would be so hard and successfully blocked by Turkish troops. Churchill then began feverishly and furiously, how shall I put it ... to pull the entire British "military-economic blanket" to the Darlanelles, intercepting reserves from the main fronts, forgetting that this whole operation was "launched" as a small and only diversion . He quarreled with dozens of naval and land commanders, officials and government colleagues. Knocking out new contingents, he "raised the stakes" and, in the end, nevertheless turned an offensive, but private defeat into ... a major British fiasco. At that time in the newspapers

and this slogan appeared: "Too much Churchill It sounded in the original language. probably like this: "Too Pisi SpitENII" Sir Winston had to resign. Ka

52 Igor Shumeiko

It seems that Lloyd George then elegantly noted: "Churchill's organic incapacity to hold any post other than Prime Minister."

Churchill was known to us for a long time by Lenin's definition: "The worst hater of the Soviet regime." He could have landed on these pages in a different, somewhere even opposite capacity. for example, as the husband of the order-bearer (so, it seems?) Clementine. His wife, Clementine Churchill, president of the Russian Aid Fund, was awarded the Order of the Red Banner of Labour. (I still try to imagine this order with the famous cogwheel and the red banner on the chest of Lady Clementine). He could also be mentioned as the head of state, the first (since June 22, 1941) ally of the USSR in World War II. Or as an outstanding historian, winner of the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1953.

But in accordance with the paradoxical needs of my genre, the pamphlet, the elephant Churchill will appear here as a continuation and development of the theory, the syllogism of the microbe—Vova Bukovsky.

In "Monument to Human Blindness", as well as in "Icebreaker" (to which it is the preface), both Vovas (Bukovsky and Rezun "prefaced" by him) accused Stalin and the USSR of Hitler's rise to power. They explained the absence of half-assertions of others, including Western historians, by the fact that they are flashing ...

... Yes, exactly the same as their Soviet counterparts - conformism. After all, even here, in the West, there are powerful political forces that are capable of making any wise guy deeply unhappy... and then see the next chapter.

And Churchill (Winston Lenard Spencer, Duke of Marlborough, 1874-1965) also does not consider Stalin and the USSR to be the culprits of Hitlerism, not in the least. So, he is also a conformist! From this place to write this memory

World War II. Reboot

flat became really more fun. The comic effect is undeniable. After all, to tell the truth, it is to Sir Winston that one more Leninist definition can be applied, memorized by all the schoolchildren of the Soviet Union: "What a block / What a seasoned human being"

Yes, it is Tolstoy and Churchill who can be called, among other things, "the greatest nonconformists of the 10th-20th centuries". For some, the very possibility of comparing the figures of Leo Tolstoy and Churchill will seem like a joke, immeasurable originality, but I am ready to make every effort to point out real points and lines of similarity, and most importantly, to prove the productivity, objective usefulness of this comparison, similar to the paired biographies of the great Greeks and Romans by Plutarch.

Churchill and Tolstoy

Let's start with the dotted line - the common lines of the outermost property. Both are representatives of ancient families, holders of feudal titles. Both lost their fathers early, but received a good supply of long-term physical health. Both at the age of 26 went to their campaigns (the Crimean and Boer wars) as volunteers and as writers (correspondents for Sovremennik and Morning Post, respectively).

And it must be admitted that the fact of Churchill's transition in 1904 from the Conservatives to the Liberal Party, and in 1923 again to the Conservatives was for the descendant of the Duke of Marlborough, and for a politician of his level, is as improbable as if he really walked downing street with a cigar and ... barefoot. This complete independence from its class. from the dictates of their corporations

(politicians, writers, historians) and, most importantly, absolute independence from contemporary conventions and mental clichés — this is what unites Sir Winston and Count Tolstoy.

8.1 Igor Shumeiko

And if only you are able to correctly understand what non-conformism is in these conditions, you will certainly recognize Sir Winston as the greatest British non-conformist, who issued, among other things, such gems:

The best argument against democracy is a five-minute conversation with the average voter. (This is in a country where almost the main pride is a centuries-old electoral system.)

He had all the virtues that I hate and not a single vice that I admire. (Also not weak in a society of conservative and Puritan traditions.)

A fanatic is a person who cannot change his views and cannot change the subject. (Very likely.)

And let one of them accept the Nobel Prize, and for several years the “Nobel committee members” probed the position of the other through relatives (“Won’t he send it?” - about the predicted refusal of the most famous writer in the world could greatly damage, as they believed, the prestige of the newly established award. Then subtle intrigues were drawn up to convince the count to accept the prize, but to no avail), the main thing that united Tolstoy and Churchill was their freedom and independence in judgment and in literary creations.

Endowed with a huge reserve of vitality, they had a very similar attitude towards medicine. And the famous Tolstoy: “...despite the fact that Prince MM was treated by doctors, he recovered.” And Churchill’s: “In my youth, I made it a rule not to drink a drop of alcohol during dinner. Now, when I am no longer young, I keep the rule not to drink a drop of alcohol before breakfast”, “At my age, I can no longer afford to feel bad.”

But what, in fact, can the author say about such well-known personalities, and where is the announced productivity of their comparison?

Let us take the most important of the topics discussed: the causes of the Second World War. Churchill in his book

World War II. Reboot 85

paradise world war” (SvigeVI! V.\$5. Tve sosopa \oia Wag. | opaon, 1951) does not tire us, the readers (just as he did not tire himself, the writer), with especially detailed statistical or archival research. (It’s scary to imagine what volumes of tables of steel production, coal production, unemployment growth graphs, armaments, population, battleship tonnage, etc. can surround this topic.) The routine that craft historians, her vel and Lev Tolstoy despised unusually. Remember how he, Lev Nikolaevich, expressed the essence of their (scientific craftsmen) work: first, they diligently do not copy from books into notebooks, and then they compose their own book out of these notebooks.

The main thing in which they found application for their abilities was in the search for that angle of view from which these slag heaps of facts had not yet been considered before them. In principle, it is clear that the work of the original historian Leo Tolstoy is obscured by the brilliant creations of Tolstoy the writer, but the originality of the historian Churchill also often eludes us.

Here is what he puts on his list of the most important causes of World War II:

“What was imposed on the Germans was the ideal that the liberals of the West aspired to ... The prejudice of the Americans against the monarchy clearly showed the defeated empire (Germanzi in 1918) that, as a republic, it could expect better treatment from

allies than as a monarchy. If we had pursued a wise policy, we would have crowned and strengthened the Weimar Republic with a constitutional monarch in the person of the young grandson of the Kaiser, placing a regency council over him. Instead, a gaping void formed in the national life of the German people. All the strong elements, military and feudal, that could have united in support of a constitutional monarchy ... were thrown out of the rut. The Weimar Republic, with all its virtues and ideas

86 Igor Shumeiko

lamy, was regarded as something bound by the enemy ... failed to win the loyalty and capture the imagination of the German people.

Rate it. This is not a discovery from archival or statistical excavations; England in the 1960s was very dependent on the support of the United States, but this does not prevent Churchill from seeing (and showing others, all readers of his memoirs) the primitiveness and limitations of the American view of history and the world order. These are the roots of today's American political correctness: in any country at any time, without a monarch (or dictator) it will certainly be more beautiful, more decent and more comfortable than with it.

And what if that Churchillian thought had visited, in 2003, for example, his "colleague" - British Prime Minister Tony Blair? And he, in addition, would have been able, with Churchill's stubbornness, to convey it to George Bush: "You shouldn't build a "Weimar Republic" in Iraq. England will not participate in this." Maybe. there would have been no London explosions.

True, the Americans always have a "good investigator" in KOMIlect and a "bad investigator". And to the Princeton idealist professor, he is a stern realist, with another, also well-known geopolitical postulate: "Our son of a bitch." But, unfortunately, the German Kaiser was not "their son of a bitch", which means: forward, to the fore – a liberal! "Long live the Weimar Republic! "That's how it went...

And so on - the whole history of interwar Europe was analyzed by Churchill "step by step". And what is interesting in his approach is that for each step towards war, Churchill identifies the main culprits - from among the great powers.

— The refusal of the United States of the guarantees of the inviolability of the borders promised to France.

- Withdrawal of French troops from the Rhineland.

— Program of American loans to Germany.

World War II. Reboot b

— The introduction of military service by Germany.

- The entry of the Wehrmacht into the Rhineland left by France.

- The assassination of the Austrian chancellor Dollfuss.

- Mussolini's attack on Ethiopia.

- Anschluss of Austria.

- In fact, a separate naval agreement between England and Germany - "Munich".

And always the top of this "hit parade of indulgence in Germany" looks something like this:

1. USA, 2. England, 3. France;

1. France, 2. England, 3. USA;

1. USA, 2. England, 3. France;

1. England, 2. Italy, 3. France;

1. France, 2. England, 3. USA;

1. Italy, 2. England, 3. France;

1. England, 2. France, 3. Italy;

1. England, 2. France, 3. Italy.

And so on. And never - the USSR. Our country appears in this period of history in general very rarely. Very many people – nevertheless, we, compatriots, have such a dash – will, on the contrary, be unpleasant and even insulting such our “non-presence” in “grand European events”. But here we just need to remind ourselves that only the ambitions of fascist Germany were “grand” at that time, and the rest of Europe was slipping into the Second World War, like a pitiful, decrepit old woman who, no one knows how, ended up on an ice hill.

So, the Soviet Union appears in pre-war history:

1. The first detailed mention of the actions of the USSR is found in Churchill only on the 87th page of his book. It is clear, dear readers, that this (page number) is not God's all indicator, even if we report for comparison that the whole story from the end of the Second World

G: | Igor Shumeiko

war before "Munich", in Churchill's memoirs of the Harvest edition - this is 170 pages.

A more reliable reference to this first mention of the USSR will be the date: May 2, 1935. The French government signed the Franco-Soviet Pact, and soon the French minister Laval visited Moscow. It was then that those negotiations took place, a fragment of which (more precisely, an incomparable anecdote) was first published just in Churchill's memoirs. See chapter |. Today it is often repeated in the context: “I.V. Stalin.” And after this colorful fragment with the same Stalinist one: “And how many divisions does the Pope of Rome have?” the continuation follows:

Laval had no intention of binding France with any of the precise commitments that the Soviets are in the habit of insisting on. And yet he succeeded in having Stalin's statement published on May 15 (1935) - the approval of France's national defense policy, with the aim of maintaining its armed forces at a certain level. As a factor in European security, the Franco-Soviet Pact ... was of limited value. France did not achieve a real alliance with Russia. In addition, on the way back, Laval stopped in Krakow. There, at the funeral of Marshal Pilsudski, he met Goering, with whom he had a cordial conversation. Laval's statements, expressing distrust and hostility towards the Soviets, were timely brought to the attention of Moscow through German channels.

2. The second time when the USSR appears as a protagonist, and now even one of the leaders of Europe, is, of course, the war in Spain. The Soviet Union is so boldly and effectively opposing Germany and Italy there that, following it, for the first time, France will take several decisive steps, venturing to provide aviation to the Spanish Republicans. But England proclaims neutrality and that one: the same, including through the mouth of Churchill, shouting at France for the first time trying to fight fascism.

World War II. Reboot |

3. Czechoslovakia. Now the manifestations of the role of the USSR will go on increasing. The USSR is trying to unite Europe and save Czechoslovakia. On March 18, we proposed to convene a conference on "... ways and means of implementing the Franco-Soviet Pact in the event of a threat to peace from Germany mania."

Now Churchill is a fierce supporter of Britain's joining this (Franco-Soviet) pact, previously criticized for being amorphous. But here is the answer of the then British Prime Minister Chamberlain:

"The plan for the "Grand Alliance," as Sir Winston calls it, crossed my mind ... we put this plan to the consideration of the Chiefs of Staff and experts of the Foreign Office. It's a very attractive idea, and there's a lot to be said in its defense until you get close to it from the point of view of its practical feasibility. One need only look at the map to see that France and we can do nothing to save Czechoslovakia from the German invasion. Therefore, I have abandoned any idea of giving guarantees to Czechoslovakia or France in connection with her obligations to that country." March 20, 1938.

Reader! It is necessary to take a good look at this letter in order to understand to what extent idiocy, foolishness can be reached (and at the same time bring the whole of Europe!), while maintaining a completely sustained diplomatic tone. After all, these are only apparently normal arguments of a normal prime minister, a normal country. But, think about it, and: what kind of theater of the absurd actually turns out.

"Great offer. Studied. Discussed with the chiefs of staff, and then how they accidentally looked at the map of Europe... Bah! Yes it. Turns out it's impossible...

And Churchill also does not hide sarcasm:

To the Chiefs of Staff and experts of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. of course, it didn't take much to strain your intellect to tell the prime minister. that english

90 Igor Shumeiko

The French fleet and the French army really cannot be turned back in the mountains of Bohemia, as a barrier between the Czechs and the Nazi invading army. It really was clear just by looking at the map...

But the main thing, in my opinion, in Chamberlain's confession is the date. As early as March 20, 1938, he (Chamberlain) actually decided to stay out of the game... and then for half a year, until the "Munich" meeting on September 30, he somehow managed to "keep the intrigue in Europe", encouraging the Czechs. he twisted their arms, disarmed them, promising other guarantees in exchange for leaving the "Sudet frontier", and in the end, he nevertheless handed them over, the Czechs, to Hitler, already actually "naked" and morally crushed.

The USSR is trying, through England and France, through the League of Nations, to obtain the consent of Poland, or at least Romania (this is already a decent hook) for permission to "military transit".

4. And, finally, the "hot summer of 1939", which ended in the famous Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact and the war.

But now I want to preface the next portion of quotations with a certain slogan that returns consciousness to the facts of that period of history.

"A Short Course in the History of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks" has been declared in our country as if it were an "odious book" and is now being used very cunningly and very stupidly at the same time. As the simplest proof "by contradiction". Suppose, it is necessary to prove that: "... At some point, the USSR was going to do something." What is the easiest way to prove this? They open the "Short Course." "See, it says here that the USSR

was going to do this? - Yes! — But this is the same great and terrible “Short Course”! — And so, it can be considered absolutely proven that the USSR was going to! »

Another thing is surprising: how important is the role of such lightweight chatter. As a result, in public

World War II. Reboot 91

In the minds of a significant part of the world, the main country that opposed Hitler (the USSR) is first transferred to the assistants (and not very skillful ones) of Britain and the USA, and then to the assistants (and also not very clever) of fascist Germany. You can, of course, just laugh at the well-known, even very loud fact that, according to the results of polls, almost a third of the “dense” Americans believe that the USSR fought on the side of Hitler in World War II. But there is also another significant part of the audience, more educated, knowing the facts and believing that Germany and the USSR were allies. accomplices, who later, however, quarreled... And today all the actions of the United States for the (forced) soft destruction of Russia, from the creation of Al Qaeda to the “cordon sanitaire” - everything is based, among other things, on this public opinion.

And most importantly, as it seems to the builders of simplified schemes (“Short Course...” with a minus sign), they “found the most vulnerable spot in the foreign policy of the USSR” — the summer of 1939, the pact ... The topic, of course, is bezlonny. And only one loophole can be closed to the water chapter, though it has been trodden through by a whole detachment of falsifiers.

So, lovers of simple evidence: “The Arat Course in the History of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks” and the British Prime Minister and historian Churchill are absolutely unanimous in their interpretation and assessment of the events of 1939 (as well as the entire pre-war period), minus assessments of communism and the domestic policy of the USSR, evaluated - of course. the above sources are diametrically opposed. Read on:

“The British and French governments made new attempts to negotiate with Soviet Russia. It was decided to send a special representative to Moscow... Instead of Eden, this most important mission was entrusted to Strang... who had no influence. The significance of such a minor person was in fact

92 Igor Shumeiko

insulting move.... The talks revolved around the unwillingness of Poland and the Baltic States to be rescued by the Soviets from Germany. The discussions continued throughout July, and finally the Soviet government proposed that the negotiations be continued by military delegations... The British government sent Admiral Drax... who, as it turned out, had no written authority to negotiate. The Russian side was represented by Marshal Voroshilov. The military conference soon failed due to the refusal of Poland and Romania to let the Russian troops through... Now we know that at the same time the Soviet government agreed to the arrival of a German representative in Moscow. Molotov and his subordinates showed amazing examples of duplicity in all respects with both sides...

The next day (August 23) Ribbentrop arrived in Moscow. It is impossible to say who he (the Pact., as follows from the context) inspired more disgust - Hitler or Stalin. Both realized that this was only a temporary measure ... Antagonism between the two empires was deadly... In favor of the Soviets, it must be said that it was vital for the Soviet Union to push the starting positions of the German armies as far west as possible... In their minds, the fiery trace of the catastrophes that their armies suffered in 1914, having launched an offensive against the Germans, having not yet completed their mobilization, and now their borders were much further east than during the first war, they had to occupy the Baltic States and most of Poland by force or deceit before they will be attacked. Their policy was guided not only by cold calculation, but also by the harsh realities of the situation ... "

And in other fragments of his memoirs, Churchill returns to these facts, and, it must be admitted, does not spare black colors, morally assessing us something like this: "...

World War II. Reboot 95

the vets looked on with malice", <... they hated and despised Western democracies", "... and we considered them prudent egoists". The title of a separate chapter devoted to this period is also characteristic: "Soviets and Nemesis". Nemesis, the goddess of vengeance, seems to have avenged us for gloating and calculated selfishness.

About the "sanitary cordon", "orderlies" and stubbornly surviving "patient"

But it is precisely these reproaches that our propagandists and counter-propagandists "should be gratefully accepted." After all, very, very different accusations really complicate the politics of modern Russia! Yes that there policy! — they are trying to make our life harder, harder, and even really poorer, building a new "cordon sanitaire" against us, uniting Poland, Lithuania, Finland, Latvia, Estonia, Romania in opposition to... "insidious and dangerous Russia, which at one time, with the help of the Molotov-Ribbentron pact, shattered their sovereignties", or occupied their territories (Yes, yes, and the voice of Romania in this choir, which lost Bessarabia in 1940, should also not be forgotten).

And the economic consequences of the "cordons" are well known to every economist. Any kind of discrimination against a country is ultimately also discrimination against its goods, its merchants. "The Butterfly Question". And the "cordon" is like... half of the blockade... And when in the fall of 2005 a memorable campaign was launched against the Russian-German gas pipeline (along the bottom of the Baltic Sea), all that remained was to wait... And sure enough! , namely, the Minister of Defense of Polynia, Radek Sikorsky, likened this agreement to the "New Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact." It was also called the "Putin-Schroeder Gas Pact." Of course, they appealed to the United States and "to all de

9 Igor Shumeiko

mocracies." (This is despite the fact that the United States has just pushed through the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan oil pipeline, bypassing Russia.) That is, these "hyena-orderlies" of Eastern Europe are striving to regain their place in the "sanitary cordon service" not just for the sake of Russophobia. The sting of the vanye also "makes a difference"! And there are countless channels of its receipt. From another Nobel Prize (Lech Walesa) to direct state aid to the Balts. And if they had succeeded in disrupting the construction of the Baltic gas pipeline, then the Polish tariffs for pumping through their territory would themselves have taken on the character of a monopoly rent.

And the same rent was removed for servicing Russian exports and imports in the Novo-Tallinsk that we built. Ventspils ports...

In the 1990s, I published an article in the journal Novaya Rossiya (former Soviet Union), partly devoted to the new geopolitical situation that developed after 1991. Gathering materials, talking with various politicians who were related to ... I remembered what cunning, multi-level intrigues went against the very idea of building a new port in Ruchiy (Ust-Luga, Leningrad region). St. Petersburg has long been unable to cope with servicing the flow of goods, and then a whole group was formed that lobbied the interests of Finnish, Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian ports, blocking (including with "environmental arguments"), any projects creation of new ports in the Leningrad region. And at the same time hastily building a new Estonian port in Sillamäe.

With my journal mission, I then found a very district ° interesting point. Head of Kingisepp Vladimir Gustov was going for a promotion - to the government of the Leningrad region. (Later he would rise even higher—become a minister and vice-premier in Primakov's government). "In the area" remained Alexander.

World War II. Reboot 95

Drozdenko. He told me about the course of this geopolitical competition. how one businessman, who bought land in the Ust-Luga region on a whim, successfully delayed the start of construction, that is, he won two whole years for the Estonians... I remember this physically clear sensation of the race. And one more time parallel. In the 1930s, when the USSR had a similar geopolitical situation (in the Baltic, not a window, but a small window), Ust-Luga almost became the most important construction site of the five-year plan. The slogan was: "Give us the Second Kronstadt"! – then they understood this simply unique vulnerability of the only port and naval base. seated in the famous "marquise puddle". In 1939, in the region of Ust-Luga - Vistino, they rushed to build the "Second Kronstadt" at a frantic pace. The accession of the Baltic republics, and by sex and the war - "closed the topic". And so, in the 1990s, geopolitical conditions are repeated - but how difficult it is for geopolitics to break into the half-poisoned consciousness of Russians! I remember how hard it was for this material about Ust-Luga to "break through" in 1995. Who? What? The sensation was that a few lone enthusiasts in the Leningrad region grappled with an international monster, with the general indifference of the whole country. It seems that they both won and were noted (the new head of the district, Alexander Drozdenko, also went on a promotion to the Leningrad region, and the direct manager of the project, Vladimir Yakunin, became the head of Russian railways), but according to the response in the public mind, this it was like winning our, somewhere very far away, football match. the rights to broadcast which, in addition, were not purchased.

Understanding comes belatedly, and when already in 2006 a response was needed to the actions of another veteran of the "cordon sanitary service" — Lithuania, which cut off communication with the Kaliningrad region, the only real answer was the ferry line Kaliningrad — Ust

96 Igor Shumeiko

Meadows. And today this port, our deepest one in the Baltic, is a breakthrough in the "cordon sanitaire", which is being built around Russia tirelessly and continuously.

And to illustrate the entire historical depth of the issue, I have one more small, but very memorable picture on the topic of "blockade". In Stockholm, not far from the observation tower Katarina-Hiessen, you will find a street of two-storey houses. It is called "Ryus-garten", "Russian Compound". In the period before the last Time of Troubles (15th century), Russia owned a segment on the coast of the Baltic, just from the present Ust-Luga to the mouth of the Neva. And after that Time of Troubles, when Russian merchants began to settle. They lived on the first floors, and on the second, or rather, in the shacks, they kept their goods. They walked around the Stockholm markets ... almost like ofeni, like peddlers. And all the more or less serious batches of classic "flax, hemp, tar, bread" were bought in Russia by Swedish merchants "on the vine". This is what the country's foreign trade has degenerated into. (In the relevant chapters of history you will also find the term "non-equivalent exchange" – about Russian trade in the 17th century). This is the eternal ideal of cordon builders, and all "pure democracy" (and sneers at our "sovereign democracy"), and all political correctness, "shortness", "work on historical mistakes", "necessity of repentance" – all to realize this ideal: "Russian farmsteads" in European capitals and Russian peddlers with matryoshka dolls on the streets...

Back to "our pacts"

And this is what should be the answer to the "hyenas-orderlies>" of the Baltic states, ideologically based on the critic\ of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact:

The British Prime Minister historian and the Short Course in the History of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks testify:
"The United States, Britain and France are guilty of the very fact of the emergence of a powerful fascist

World War II. Reboot 97

which Germany. And the USSR, as the threat of war grew, took the necessary (although, as it turned out, insufficient) measures of defense.

After all, to be an observer (even gloating) of Chamberlain's betrayal of Europe is not at all the same as being its accomplice!

Evaluate now the next fragment. Consequences of the Pact:

"... @ after two weeks (of hostilities) the Polish army of about two million people ceased to exist. The turn of the Soviets has come. On September 17, the Russian armies surged across the almost undefended eastern border and marched west on a broad front. On September 18 they met with their German partners in Brest-Litovsk. Here, during the last war, the Bolsheviks, in violation of their official agreements with the Western allies, concluded a separate peace with Kaiser Germany and submitted to its rude conditions. Now in Brest-Litovsk, Russian communists were grinning and shaking hands with representatives of Nazi Germany ... "

Undoubtedly, another unique value of Churchill's view is that he is a veteran of both world wars. And in his "History" these passing introductory phrases: "... but in the last war ...", "... and in the last war he was ...", "... and in the last war it took ' is just the main refrain. This is the way of thinking of the wise man, the leading strategist of both world wars. Here he mentions the meeting of Soviet and German troops on September 18, 1939 in Brest-Litovsk — and, of course, he recalls that it was here in 1918 “during the past war” that the Brest Treaty between Russia and Germany was concluded.

Here, if Churchill does not blame, then he reminds of one undeniably “aggravating circumstance”, as if he concentrates, condenses history, turning Brest-Litovsk into some kind of “simply bewitched” place of Russian-German “collusions”.

98 Igor Shumeiko

Three more paragraphs - "on the role of the historian in the working order"

Of course, I shared the idea (and first drafts) of this book with some of our reputable book publishers, publicist historians. To be honest: no approval, not even “ardent support”, even cries of “bravo” (if such had happened), about some fragments, did not balance out even a slight bewilderment (disapproval) about ... including the fact that what will be discussed now.

It seems to me that the role of history as a field for interethnic dialogues, disputes, and rivalry will only grow. The proof is the most elementary. The total mass of controversy, “spilled in the world”, is either a constant value, or certainly a non-decreasing one. The proportion of “ideological elites” leading (voicing) disputes, as well as communication opportunities, is growing. Meanwhile, the number of “polemical platforms” has decreased. Previously, for example, dialogues and disputes between the USSR and the USA were sublimated and pushed into the sphere of political economy. Roughly speaking, the dispute was: who is more right, Marx or Keynes?

Just remember how much was discussed, what share of public attention was occupied by that very ... “convergence”. It was a complex thing, approximately convergence could be understood (interestingly, who understood it not approximately?) as a variant of a draw in the Marx-Keynes match. And those who played “to win” fell upon the “convergence” from both sides. Agree that today the volume of these political and economic disputes is significantly turned up. The “religious platform for disputes” has also been fairly empty for a long time. Also a characteristic moment. At first there were disputes (wars) directly for dogmas. Then the wars, how to say...for the “mass of the flock”. (The flock was understood as a kind of pasta. Whose will pass it?). Now, comme il faut, only disputes over the history of religions are permissible.

World War II. Reboot

Fukuyama's famous "The End of History" can be understood in such a way that they will stop making history (in order to avoid a "nuclear winter"), and will be occupied with its interpretation. And if the proportion of "historical" disputes and the proportion of public attention to them is growing, then the former tactics of gloomy denial or silence are absolutely unacceptable.

What I faced

No, not in the sense that they tried to "silence" me, not to let the book go to print. After all, with the income from some other publications, I could publish ten such books at my own expense. But I was "extremely strained" by the tactics of perception - something like this: "Well, Adolf Hitler as a trustee of CJSCE Europe is good, right. But the fuss with Churchill, as the "bitter hater" is known, is in vain. The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in 1918 is generally too big a tragic topic. Why even attract her to the Second World War? And the Russians, grinning and shaking hands with representatives of Nazi Germany in the same Brest - this is generally ... in the spirit of Rezun, which you refuted!"

Here it is. Here I am ready to "tilt on the principle." My approach is in the following theses.

1. Churchill (the British in general) have the right to remind us of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in 1918. No matter how many "historical difficulties" you add, it's also just a separate peace, a violation of allied treaties.
2. No matter how much they hid or unlocked, there was some addendum to the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact about the dividing line in Poland. Otherwise, the Soviet and German troops would have simply mixed into a mess. And they, as you know, closed very neatly. In the same Brest.
3. Conclusion. In the first war, we behaved ... inadequately. They rushed to Austria for the southern Slavs! to Germany (not

Igor Shumeiko

mobilized) - save Paris! Not that "too nobly", "in knightly armor, with a tournament spear - on the tank." Namely, inadequate. Lost. So... Victory requires other preparatory steps.

4. Soviet troops crossed the unprotected eastern (Polish) border. Note: on a romantic (or everyday) level, not protected - it sounds touching, and as an additional condemnation of the offender. In the world of Real Politician it is exactly the opposite! Unprotected means that no Polish troops were drawn to it. This means that the USSR did not influence the course (and outcome) of the two-week Polish-German war by a hair!
5. Our Western ally, after all, admits in the end: In favor of the Soviets, it must be said that it was vital for the Soviet Union to move the starting positions of the German armies as far as possible to the west. So the Russian-German handshake in Brest in 1939 is not the capitulation of 1918, but, as it were, a greeting of the boxers before the fight. This means that it contains the seed of the future liberation of Poland.
6. And now, after this cold calculation of facts and factors, one can find a place for the "moral-heroic". And then remember: after all, after those two gloomy Brest (1918 and 1939) there was also ... Third Brest!

Yes Yes! The famous heroic Brest Fortress, which lasted longer. than all of Poland in 1939! Longer than united England and France in 1940! For a month there were battles, according to modern military terminology. "of high intensity", and for a few more months, almost until October 1941, there was focal resistance.

In de Gaulle's France, the following strategy was developed: "Defense in all azimuths." So, for the fighters of the "ideological front": denial "in all azimuths", or even

rejecting "in all azimuths" is just ... the wrong strategy. And the current

World War II. Reboot

Defenders of the ideals and history of Russia should most of all be wary of the "approaching reinforcements" - the former defenders of the ideals of socialism.

Returning to diplomacy

That's why it's so 'oh oh oh, so much Churchill!' in this book. But, let's say, the same thing (about the West's fault in the formation of fascist Germany) is also spoken by many other Western historians who are not blinded by Russophobia ("conformists", by Bukovsky's definition). "There is a lot of Churchill" in this book also because his view is valuable because it is a view from the inside. And it's not just about Sir Winston's forty years of parliamentary experience, not only about the unique list of his ministerial posts:

1911-1915 - First Lord of the Admiralty (Minister of the Sea),

1919-1921 - Minister of War and Minister of Aviation,

1924-1929 - Minister of Finance,

1939-1940 - Minister of the Navy,

1940-1945 - head of the coalition government,

1951-1955 - head of the Conservative government.

It is also about a unique position that makes it possible to observe things like this one:

"... (German Ambassador) Ribbentrop at that time was about to leave London and take up the post of German Foreign Minister. Chamberlain gave a farewell breakfast in his honor at 10 Downing Street. My wife and I also accepted the Prime Minister's invitation... There were about 16 people present. ... Approximately in the middle of breakfast, a courier from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs handed over a package. I noticed that Chamberlain was deep in thought. Later, I was told the contents of the letter: "Hitler has invaded Austria, mechanized units are rapidly advancing towards Vienna" ... Breakfast went on as usual, but soon Mrs.

Igor Shumeiko

Berlen, having received some signal from her husband, got up and said: "Let's all go to the living room and have coffee." It became clear to me that they really wanted to finish the reception as soon as possible. Everyone, seized with incomprehensible anxiety, stood, preparing to say goodbye to the guests of honor.

However, Ribbentrop and his wife did not seem to notice. On the contrary, they lingered for half an hour, engaging the host and hostess in lively conversation.

Then Churchill intervened, went up to Mrs. Ribbentrop and said the "accelerating-farewell" phrase: "I hope that England and Germany will maintain friendly relations." "Just try not to break them yourself," she replied coquettishly.

I am sure that they both understood perfectly well what had happened, but considered it a smart move to keep the Prime Minister from his business duties and the telephone for a longer time ... Finally, Chamberlain turned to the ambassador: "I beg your pardon, but now I have to attend to urgent business," and left the living room without further ado. The Ribbentrops were still delayed, but most of us withdrew under various pretexts. Finally, they also bowed. I never saw Ribbentrop again until he was hanged."

Do you understand the power of that last phrase? Here comes the "social party". Tailcoats, an exchange of barbs and all sorts of Bop p1o {. And even an urgent despatch about the threat of a new European war cannot make us forget the requirements of etiquette. It is impossible not to offer the guest coffee (by the way, coffee is served - and of course! - in another room, not where breakfast was held). (I also remembered Bulgakov's cat Behemoth, who objected to Woland: "You can't kick me out, I haven't even drunk coffee.") ... England still has half an hour of time at a time when the speed of diplomatic reactions is especially important. But still, the most valuable phrase is in that amazing

World War II. Reboot 103

final fragment: "... Finally, they took their leave. In Bolyn, I never saw Ribbentrop until the moment he was hanged." Only it should not be understood that Sir Churchill came to Nuremberg in 1946 to look at the hanged Ribbentrop (or at the hanging procedure itself). This, of course, is not Churchill's reminder of things taken for granted: 1) during the war, the ministers of England and Germany could not see each other, 2) Ribbentrop, as the whole world is well aware, was a member of the first um... "eleven" hanged by sentence in Nuremberg.

This Metepu top is the Voice of History itself, a reminder of how the social gatherings at the Chamberlains ended. A sudden reminder that evokes even a sound association: ominous chords are the "hand of fate" knocking in Beethoven's sonata. Or an energetic film montage: here is a man in a tailcoat, with a cup of coffee - and here he is with a noose around his neck. Perhaps this is a subconsciously found technique. After all, Churchill, constantly criticizing Chamberlain's policy, his short-sighted "gentlemanly" with Hitler, never allowed himself a single condemning statement about Chamberlain's personality. Everything is only about his nobility, impeccable manners, impeccable self-control... And here it is, "the heavy tread of fate": it turns out that even the bearers of excellent manners, salon visitors, happen to be hanged.

This Metepto is the one! to all salon diplomats, Churchill is very reminiscent of Leo Tolstoy. The count in "War and Peace" contemptuously laughs not only at the irresponsibility, but also at the uselessness of all diplomacy of "good form" in the face of the "Bolya War", sarcastically repeating the question: "... Therefore, it was worth only Metternich Rumyantsev or Talleyrand, between the exit and the reception, try hard and write a more ingenious piece of paper ... and there would be no war.

Another counterpoint of the First volume of memoirs (The Unleashing of the War) is another Churchillian Metepyu toy: him, interrupting the blessed diplomatic

Igor Shumeiko

chatter, periodic tie-ins about the growth of the Luft-Waffe, about the backlog of the Royal Air Force. It appears that Sir Winston (1919-1921 Secretary of War and Air Minister) was the first in the British Isles, and for a long time the only one, to foresee the new role of aviation in the coming war.

Yes! But there was also this one ... like him ...

... Mussolini. Exactly! He is! After all, there was also a country - from the category of "Great Powers" (the list is strictly, formally defined, and very limited). That is, there was also one Great Power, putting it "on the other side". There was... for sure, Mussolini, the true owner of the brand "fascism", who sometimes considered even the German "Nazism" either a cheap "licensed copy", or even a fake. (Mussolini as the author of the fanio style, forged like today's Armani or Gucci.)

There was also a corresponding set of political and diplomatic moves by England, France, the USA and the League of Nations. encouraging Mussolini, turning this... a little foppish, a little

decorative character in...

After all, Italy was not a loser in the First World War, and Versailles was a symbol for it — not humiliation, but vice versa, a kind of Christmas tree, a place to receive a few little-deserved (for a miserable contribution to the victory of 1918) gifts. The more “cleaner the experiment”, the more interesting and revealing the history of the fascistization of the country in this example.

Lloyd George, who was on friendly terms with Mussolini, noted how he (Mussolini) was struck, how he remembered the case when Oxford students took a solemn oath never to fight for the king and the Motherland ... That's how I would bring Hitler and Mussolini together, under what term united, so it is - impressionism.

World War II. Reboot

Iu Adolf is full of these passages: "And then I understood - Czech / (Jew, Croat, Russian)", <... then suddenly I understood to myself ... "So Mussolini then - "understood the Englishman." (And I misunderstood.) And if we return to the term “political correctness”, which has already been mentioned many times, then we can summarize: it was English “political correctness” that created Mussolini's “incorrect”, incorrect image of an Englishman. After all, this is the now famous word “sotges”, which has become part of the most important global term. just something and meant (before, anyway, meant) "correct".

The subsequent steps of England (and the League of Nations) to encourage Mussolini will be given very briefly and again with expressive quotations from Churchill. 1935, Mussolini prepares to attack Abyssinia (Ethiopia). In England, then Prime Minister Baldwin. The coincidence of his policy, his style with the subsequent, Chamberlain's ones is an additional proof of everything stated in

"Munich-Czech" chapters.

“It was only a few months later that I began to understand the principles on which the sanctions (against Italy) were based. The Prime Minister declared that, firstly, sanctions meant war; secondly, he firmly resolved to prevent it; thirdly, he firmly resolved to implement the sanctions ... Under the leadership of England and Laval (Frannia) The Nations, tasked with developing the sanctions program, refrained from anything that could provoke a war. A grandiose plan was drawn up, the supply of many goods to Italy was prohibited. But oil. without which the Abyssinian campaign could not continue, acted freely, since it was believed that the cessation of its supply would unleash a war. The export of aluminum to Italy was strictly forbidden, but just aluminum was one of the few metals produced by Italy in quantities exceeding its own needs. The import of scrap iron and iron ore was banned, but in

Igor Shumeiko

In the production cycle of Italian metallurgy, steel ingots and cast iron were used, but the list was not extended to them ...

Even to a lesser extent, England was determined to use her fleet. All sorts of fables were told about the Italian squadrons of dive bombers with suicide pilots - MI ... But in fact, this peacefulness was one of the reasons that led to a more terrible war. Mussolini succeeded in his bluff, and from this fact one important observer (Hitler) drew far-reaching conclusions for himself. In Japan, too, they closely watched the development of events...

All Italian supplies went through the Suez Canal, controlled by the British, the English fleet outnumbered the Italian four times.

... But it turned out that we had few fighters for air cover and very few shells for anti-aircraft artillery ... the admiral in command of the fleet was indignant that he was credited with the statement that he did not have sufficient forces for combat operations ... "

And so on. The picture of complete chaos, absurdity, vanity, helplessness of governments, until the war finally takes on the character of a Great, People's War, is drawn by Churchill quite colorfully. Especially this thirst - probably, of all the administrations of the world - to pick up as many assignments and functions as possible. And it is especially desirable that these instructions be mutually exclusive, so that it is easier to explain the widespread failures.

And since from the very beginning of the chapter a certain similarity between Churchill and Leo Tolstoy was declared, then evaluate this fragment as well.

"Count Rostopchin, who either shamed those who were leaving, then took out official places, then gave worthless weapons to drunken rabble, then raised images, then forbade Augustine to take out moshes and icons, then

World War II. Reboot

wove all the private carts that were in Moscow. sometimes he took away the balloon made by Leppich on 136 nodvods; , then gathered the people to the Three Mountains. in order to fight the French, then in order to get rid of this people, he gave them a man to kill and he himself left for the front gate; either he said that he would not survive the misfortune of Moscow, or he wrote poems in French in his albums about his participation in this matter - this man did not understand the significance of the ongoing event, but only wanted to do something himself, to surprise someone ... how a boy frolicked over the majestic and inevitable event of the abandonment and burning of Moscow and tried with his small hand to either encourage or delay the course of the huge stream of people that carried him along with it "(War and Peace. Volume 3.)

Rostopchin repeats everywhere that his main goals are: 1) maintaining calm in Moscow, 2) gradual evacuation. Surely this corresponded to the orders of the guy ... And again the word to Lev Nikolaevich:

"If we admit this dual purpose, every action of Rastopchin turns out to be irreproachable. Why weren't Moscow's relics, weapons, cartridges, gunpowder, stocks of grain taken out, why were the residents deceived that Moscow would not be surrendered, and ruined (before they had time to take out their property)? — In order to maintain peace in the capital. .. (point 1) Why were piles of unnecessary papers taken out of government offices, ziar Leppikha?—Evacuation (point 2)."

Yes, it is clear that all the stupid things that are only theoretically possible — they will be committed. All options for clouding the mind will inevitably happen. This removal of papers from "public places" is already good - unnecessary even in peacetime (imagine, for example, some kind of "Archive

Igor Shumeiko

appeals and complaints to the DEZ"). But this ball of Leppich is especially beautiful. Apparently, it is still inevitable that in the midst of the most intense war, another madman "with a project" will break through to the authorities and will be listened to, and approved and provided with all the requested means. It seemed that everyone was laughing at Leppich, saying that his ball would produce some effect, if only (this is me no longer from War and Peace, that ball was remembered by many): "... if only the French they will be so kind as to gather in one place (coordinated with the direction of the wind and Mr. Leppich) and huddle into the crowd as tightly as possible, body to body, and kindly wait until he throws bags of gunpowder, "but here it is. ..

In 1811, the Dutchman Leppich offered this "perpetuum mobile" to Napoleon, but was, of course, expelled. And here you are - a wonderful side, peripheral detail: the Patriotic War is on. Horses and carts are one of the most important resources (Andrei Parshev, in his well-known book "Why is Russia not America?", cites Kutuzov's calculation in 1812 on our superiority in vehicles as an example of a wise strategy) ... And this crazy

the balloon is first shipped to Nizhny Novgorod, then... near St. Petersburg, and already in November (can you imagine? - there are battles near the Berezina), a test launch is made in Oranienbaum. The ball didn't fly...

"To him (Rastopchin) it not only seemed (as it seems to every administrator) that he controlled the external actions of the inhabitants of Moscow. but it seemed to him that he also directed their moods by means of posters. written in the stern language, which the people in their midst despise, and which they do not understand when they hear from above.

Moscow was burned by the inhabitants, it is true, but not by those who remained in it, but by those who left it. Moscow, occupied by the enemy, did not remain intact, like Berlin, Vienna, only due to the fact that the inhabitants did not bring the keys to the French, but left it.

World War II. Reload p:

More will be said about our Rastopchins of 1941-1942, and that corresponding chapter should be thrown from here as a bridge - this is the conclusion, this is a semi-intuitive understanding of people like Churchill and Leo Tolstoy: war can be either Absurd , or Folk.

It gets ridiculous. Well, don't let go! "Too much Churchill" also because Sir Winston - could he even imagine it! — in 1956, he was mobilized by the Central Committee of the CPSU — to carry out purely intra-party clashes. As you know, Khrushchev's "military" accusations against Stalin were reduced, strictly speaking, to two points:

1) led the war around the globe.

2) did not heed Churchill's warning about the imminent start of the WAR.

Khrushchev: "From the documents now published, it is clear that even on April 3, 1941, Churchill, through the British ambassador to the USSR, Cripps, made a personal warning to Stalin that the German troops had begun to redeploy, preparing an attack on the Soviet Union ... Churchill pointed out in his message that he asks "to warn Stalin in order to draw his attention to the danger that threatens him." Churchill insistently emphasized this both in the telegrams of April 18 and in the following days. However, these warnings were not taken into account by Stalin.

Here, dear readers, the agenda seems to me like this:

"Gr-well __ Churchill to appear ... dates, Old Square, house 2, to give evidence."

And Khrushchev, probing the prosecutor: "And tell me more, Citizen Churchill, when you visited Comrade Stalin in Moscow, did you see in his office ... a globe

Well, then you have ... "testimony of Citizen Churchill":

by Igor Shumeiko

"I wrote a short and cryptic letter, hoping that the facts given and that it was the first letter I sent him after my official telegram of 25 June 1940 recommending Sir Cripps as ambassador, would attract his attention. and make you think."

Here is this short and cryptic letter ... "attached to the Case":

Prime Minister to Stafford Cripps April 3, 1941

"Give the following letter from me to Stalin - provided that you personally deliver it.

- I have reliable information from a reliable agent that when the Germans considered Yugoslavia caught in their network, i.e. after March 20, they began to transfer from Romania to

South Holsha three of their five armored divisions. As soon as they learned about the Serbian revolution, this movement was cancelled. Your Excellency will easily understand the significance of these facts.”

But Ambassador Cripps did not fulfill Churchill's instructions, explaining that he had written a letter to Vyshinsky the day before with approximately the same warnings, and was afraid of "weakening the impression" in the second place. This, however, is the version of Churchill himself, and whether he really wanted his enigmatic letter to land on Stalin's table in time is a difficult question.

“... I was annoyed by this and the past delay. This was the only message before the invasion of Germany that I sent directly to Stalin. Its brevity, its exceptional character, the fact that it came from the head of the government... should have attracted Stalin's attention.

World War II. Reboot

... Lord Beaverbrook informed me that during his trip to Moscow in October 1941. you (Mr. Stalin) asked him: “What did Churchill mean when he said in Parliament that he had warned me about the impending German attack?” “Yes, I did say that,” I said, “referring to the telegram I sent you in April 1941.” And I took out the telegram, which Sir Stafford Crips delivered late. When the telegram was read and translated to Stalin, he shrugged his shoulders: “I remember it. I didn't need any warnings. I knew that the war would begin, but I thought that I would be able to win another six months or so ... * ”

On the afternoon of June 22, 1941, Churchill spoke on the radio. the first of the leaders of countries around the world:

“The Nazi regime has the worst features of communism. It has no foundations and principles, except for greed and the desire for racial domination ... Over the past 25 years, no one has been a more consistent opponent of communism than me. I will not take back a single word I said about him. But all this pales before the spectacle now unfolding. The past with its crimes, follies and tragedies disappears.

I see Russian soldiers defending their land, their fields, which their fathers have cultivated since time immemorial. I see them protecting their crowbars, where their mothers and wives pray—yes, for there are times when everyone prays—for the safety of their loved ones... I see tens of thousands of Russian villages where, with great difficulty, the daily bread, but where true human joys exist, where girls laugh and children play. I see how the vile Nazi war machine is approaching all this with its shaggy, rattling spurs Prussian officers, with its skillful agents and the gray mass of drilled ferocious soldiers ... a machine that has just subdued and tied hands and the feet of dozens of countries ...

^

[1: Igor Shumeiko

..I must announce the decision of His Majesty's Government and I am sure that all great domitions will agree with this decision in due time, for we must speak at once, without a single day of delay ...

We have only one single unchanging goal. We are determined to destroy Hitler and all traces of his Nazi regime. Nothing can turn us away from it, nothing. We will never negotiate, we will never enter into negotiations with Hitler or any of his gang. We will fight him on land, we will fight him at sea, we will fight him in the air until, with God's help, we have delivered the earth from his very shadow and freed the nations from his yoke. Any person or state that fights against Nazism will receive our help... It follows that we will give Russia and the Russian people all the help we can...

... Now is not the time to moralize about the madness of countries and governments that have allowed themselves to be defeated one by one, although together they were able to save themselves and the whole world ... "

On July 3, 1941, in a radio address to the Soviet people, Stalin said: "... The historic speech of the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Churchill, about helping the Soviet Union and the declaration of the US government about its readiness to provide assistance to our country, which can evoke only a feeling of gratitude in the hearts of the peoples of the Soviet Union, are quite understandable and exemplary."

Chapter 9 New Top Managers of "United Europe"

On March 17, 1940, the Reich Ministry for Armaments and Ammunition (Reichssturm und Munition) was created, which became the main organizer of the German war industry right up to the end of the war. Much has been written about it, but here we note the following interesting fact: both during the period of preparation for war (the well-known "Four-Year Plan") and in the first six months or more of the World War, Germany somehow managed without this ministry. How?

Each branch of the armed forces designed, issued orders and received weapons, military economic property and ammunition, developed plans for the material support of its production program. And the direct producers were "old non-German concerns."

For example, tank building in Germany was run by nine major concerns that supplied tanks and armored hulls. They controlled 32 factories owned by 27 different firms. And it is characteristic that these firms specialized not only in this area. Of the eight Daimler-Benz factories, only one produced tanks.

st: Igor Shumeiko

That is, the structure of German manufacturing firms functioned as it had in the 20th century.

Then what is the reason for such a radical reform in March 1940? Of course, a new level of weapons needs for the Wehrmacht... BUT also a new level of capabilities. New mines, power stations, deposits, factories... In April 1940, a Denmark-Norway strike was planned. In May - Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg and the super prize - France. And the experience of the protectorates of the Czech Republic and Moravia, which at that time had already been working on it for two years, prompted Hitler: "Industrialized", "cultural" countries will hand over everything intact, "without fanatical excesses" and will dutifully work (perhaps, and expecting that someone will someday risk the integrity of his "real estate", start a real war, "come", "liberate"). That's how it all happened.

The Reich received huge French strategic reserves: 8.5 thousand tons of oil, tens of thousands of tons of non-ferrous metals, 5,000 steam locomotives, 40,000 cars (although this is combined with the Belgian and Dutch ones).

Thus, created on March 17, 1940, not in the period of preparation ("Four-Year Plan"), but already during the war, the Imperial Ministry of Armaments and Ammunition (Vesistii enpt 91e UMAE ipa Minuop), which was led by the notorious Todt and Steer is the governing body of the industry of precisely the "United Europe".

The Czechs are already working, but as for the Norwegians, Danes, Dutch, Belgians and French in the Reich, there is a calm certainty: they will work!

However, there was a problem in the broad sense of the word: food. In the spring of 1941, the Reich reduced consumption rates for a number of foodstuffs. But it turns out that officials from the Ministry of Food

World War II. Reboot 115

The Volunteers had calculated long before that: "The European war can be continued only if the entire Wehrmacht is in the third year of hostilities (this means, counting from September-39, and not from June-41, the third year of the war in Russia was not planned in any way.—Author's note) will be fed at the expense of Russia."

On May 15, the German newspapers announced that the meat ration, given out on ration cards from June, would be cut by 100 grams per week. The representation of horsemeat in this diet grew more and more.

Here is another, perhaps somewhat unexpected, example of understanding the essence of that war. Our poet, also of a princely family ("also" — I recalled the French Count Exupery mentioned in Chapter 1 — as a cover for French and European collaborators) wrote refined, "neoclassical" poetry before and after the war. But in the war itself, the wounded captain of the guard wrote:

You do not consider our land to be a paradise, But as a wheaten land, a foreign loaf, With a bayonet you cut off the best third. We know for sure what we are dying for: We are taking away your native land, And you are to die for stolen bread! (Arseny Tarkovsky)

German breweries were short of barley. Erzap beer It was made on the basis of dairy production waste. Drinking it was, of course, the most difficult, perhaps unbearable test for the "Aryan spirit."

In general, even France's diligent annual reparations deliveries did not help: 750,000 tons of wheat, 140,000 tons of meat, 650 million liters of milk, 220 million liters of wine.

This is what became the main factor for the developers of the Barbarossa plan.

Igor Shumeiko

Next, we will quote the English historian Liddell Hart (Sir Basil Henry Liddell Hart \ 3m Vaz Nepgu 44e] Nap), who became the leading modern British historian, whose work "The Second World War" became, according to experts, "almost the main official history of English armed forces."

"...According to Hitler, Germany should have acquired more "agriculturally useful space" in the sparsely populated areas of Eastern Europe. It would be vain to hope that this space would be readily conceded to it. "The history of all times is the Roman Empire. The British Empire proved that any spatial expansion can be carried out only by suppressing resistance, by taking risks... Neither in the past nor now has there existed and does not exist a space without an owner." This problem should have been solved no later than 1945, because "after that, only changes for the worse can be expected." All possible channels of supply would then be blocked, and the crisis of food supply would worsen.

Hitler's plans were much wider than the intention to return the territories taken from Germany after the First World War, and it would be wrong to claim that Western statesmen were not aware of this. In 1937-1938, many of them were very frank in private conversations, but not in their public speeches. Many proposals were put forward in British government circles to allow Germany to expand eastward and thus avert the danger from the West. These circles were sympathetic to Hitler's desire to acquire living space and made it clear to him. However, they did not bother to think about how, if not by the use of overwhelming force, the owners of this space could be forced to submit.

German documents show that Hitler was particularly encouraged by the visit of Lord Halifax in November 1937.

World War II. Reboot

Halifax was then Lord President of the Council, second in command to the government after the prime minister. A transcript of the conversation between Halifax and Hitler has been preserved. Halifax let Hitler know that England would not interfere with him in Eastern Europe. Perhaps Halifax did not mean exactly this, but such was the impression from his words, and it was extremely important.

meaning..."

I would like to complete the topic of "incentive-nourishing" motives for adopting the "Barbarossa" plan with an example of a surprisingly accurate understanding of this abstruse "German geopolitics" by our people, what Halder calls the "Continental thinking of the Fuhrer". And this understanding was expressed with such dignity and truly simply with royal sarcasm that it is impossible not to be filled with pride for compatriots...

In addition to the famous "Moscow march" of columns of German prisoners, on August 16, 1944, "... the escort of a group of German prisoners in the amount of 36,918 people" was also carried out in the city of Kyiv. The NKVD monitored the behavior of our citizens during the passage. All statements, cries, actions were carefully recorded. There were, of course, spitting, threats, calls to shoot, BUT — throwing stones was not recorded... Academician of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine Sokolov "compared this to 1941, when the Germans were leading Soviet prisoners... ours are not right, allowing such a good attitude towards the Fritz.

And here is this truly delightful, albeit underestimated episode (from Khrushchev's report to Stalin): <... in the bazaar area, young women threw eggshells into the column with exclamations: "Would you like an egg?/"

Ordinary women who have lost their father and husband and are doomed to decades of poverty, living in dugouts and the hardest work to restore what was carefully preserved in France and the Netherlands - these women, who heard the main German geopolitical slogan for two or three years: "Milk, bread. egg!" - they found a nobly simple and ingeniously witty

answer...

118 Igor Shumeiko

Still interesting - I don't know if anyone paid attention: among the leaders of the new level of "Euromanagement" - the Ministers Keasytziishchegit Fe Uaye ipa Mipyup - an interesting "architectural and construction bias" was discovered. The first Reich Minister was Fritz Tolt, previously the head of the nationwide construction organization Todt, which created the famous Reichsautobahns to this day. But on November 29, 1941 (literally 5 days before the start of our counter-offensive near Moscow), Todt submitted a very gloomy report to the Fuhrer ("the war has already been lost militarily and economically, a political settlement is needed"), and then in 1942, he died in a somewhat strange aviation accident.

The next and, in fact, the last Reich Minister was the favorite architect of the Fuhrer Speer. He suddenly turned out to be a very successful leader of the industry of the "United Europe". In two years, he managed, for example, to achieve a threefold increase in the production of armored vehicles. The years of his leadership of the ministry are called the "era of Speer". Even among the questions to the future hero of the "Nuremberg Trials" there were such ... with a certain touch of admiration: "... but how did you manage? »

But let's not draw too much a note of admiration for this "European manager" - in terms of tank production, he still lost to the USSR. The following statement of his is known: "... the German armaments industry does not accept the assembly line method of America and Russia, but mainly relies on German skilled labor."

The "Speer" principle of duplicating the supply of units and assemblies from different plants was unnecessarily complicated and led to huge overloads of the transport system. For example, 136 subcontractors were involved in the production of Rapner U Rap(Terr). Hulls were supplied by 6 factories, engines - 2, gearboxes - 3, tracks - 4, turrets - 5,

World War II. Reboot 19

weapons - 1, optics - 1, steel casting - 14, forgings - 15, the rest - finished units, parts and fasteners.

In "apology" Speer is given the need to disperse capacities and reduce their vulnerability to aerial bombardment. BUT, one can again recall the KV tanks produced in the besieged Leningrad, the Stalingrad tractor tank.

SH LONG-TERM REQUESTS

And why, exactly?

"Special historians" on some topics are so dominated by standards, including "double standards", that it is precisely "Amateurish requests" (not to be confused with deputy requests) that are required in order to return simple common sense, for example, to the sphere of assessing "participation, Complicity and Resistance to Hitler" in the Second World War.

And why precisely on November 29, 1941 that same Todt went... etc.2

Indeed, it is interesting to reflect on the date of the suicide "Todt" report to the Führer ("the war is lost") ... 29 November. Why exactly then? ...

Maybe the "business executive" Todt somehow found out about the Soviet military strike being prepared on December 5, which became sudden even for the German generals, and was afraid that instead of the Reichsautobahns he would soon have to build the BAM? This variant – "with the help of flocks I learned about..." – is, of course, nonsense, Alexander-Dyumovism. My guess is this. The date of the report is, as it were, the point of solving the equation:

1) the moment of getting the maximum piece of the country, but 2) BEFORE the first military defeat. He is. Todt, is responsible for the economic return of the occupied lands.

Let's say, August-41 - he received too little to judge, January-42 - his problems are already obscured by military defeat. And the end of November-41 - just: he has,

Igor Shumeiko

Todt already has all of Ukraine, Belarus and half of the Black Earth region, so far (seemingly) no claims to the military (offensive schedule: captured square kilometers/days is almost Polish). And the prospects for economic development, "cooperation", as it turned out...

... All of them (prospects), simply savoring, are listed by Ilya Ehrenburg. In Kaluga, two swindlers promised to "arrange the production of gas water." No, don't be alarmed, "gas water" - this is not in terms of chemical weapons - "soda". How many Germans rushed with this couple! — and sales... well, just imagine the vital importance of soda in occupied Kaluga! And in Kyiv, it seems, a newspaper began to appear. The publisher, as it turned out, is the Romanian pimp Buzeskul...

In December 1941, a special commission for the production of tanks and spare parts studied the possibility of attracting the industrial potential of the occupied part of the USSR. Some hopes were pinned on the production of tank armored hulls at the plant named after Ilyich in Mariupol, which the Germans inherited with less damage ... But this plant, like other Soviet plants, was not included in the Nazi ZAO Evropa. After all, in addition to a successful or unsuccessful undermining of factory buildings during the retreat, a "blocking stake" (if we continue the shareholder

terminology) possessed "cadres", people. And if in Paris, Brussels, Copenhagen and Prague they were ready to work under any flag, then in Mariupol, Donbass, the situation was completely different. Add to this the dependence of factories on infrastructure: water pumps and power lines were blown up. The famous "rail war" ... - true. for these acts of sabotage one had to pay not only with "real estate". In Belorussia, the Germans put 400 hostages on the rails and let the steam locomotive go... But it is hard for citizens of the countries that were former shareholders of the Hitlerite Closed Joint-Stock Company to imagine. Most

World War II. Reboot

The heroes of the Resistance they imagine are Keanu Reeves and his girlfriend in the movie The Matrix.

In 1940-1941, German tank-building firms, on instructions from the Ministry of Armaments and Ammunition, ordered a number of parts from small machine-building firms in France, Belgium, Denmark, and Romania. But a special contribution was made by the Škoda factories in Pilsen and ĽKD in Prague (renamed by the Germans to VMM), which, until the very end of the war, produced light tanks and self-propelled guns of their own, Czech design for the Wehrmacht. True, the production of medium or heavy tanks of German design did not develop here.

In Austria, on the basis of the Styrian mines near Linin, a large metallurgical plant was built with workshops for the production of armored hulls. Similar workshops operated at the high-quality metallurgy plant of the Beler company in Kalfenberg. This made it possible to build medium and heavy tanks at the large Nibelungen plant in St. Valentine. Its products, as well as those of the Czech firms Skoda and VMM, are listed as German in all statistical reports.

Let us once again give the floor to Reichsminister Spteer, or rather. let us reproduce the word he uttered at the Nuremberg trials:

"The steady increase in military production up to the autumn of 1944 is truly amazing. However, this was not enough to meet the needs of the front, and every front-line soldier can confirm this sad fact. Fierce fighting in Russia and Normandy, as well as catastrophic retreats in the summer of 1944, led to such losses that our rear could not compensate for ... the denouement came after the fuel supply was cut off and our communications were destroyed as a result devastating raids by the Anglo-Americans. Although there were weapons and ammunition in Germany, they, at least in sufficient quantities, could no longer be delivered to the front.

122 Igor Shumeiko

On the other hand, the Allies had everything they needed, and the resources available to the Allied command in the United States and in the British Empire were so great that it was possible to transfer to Russia a huge amount of military material. It should not be forgotten that Russia itself was superior to the Western allies in the production of artillery pieces and tanks. The overwhelming economic superiority of the enemy and our inability to repel his air raids clearly showed that we had no chance of a victorious conclusion to the war. I don't blame the German industry. The EU's achievements were enormous, but still it could not compete with the productive power of the United States, the British Empire and the Soviet Union. A war with these three powers at the same time was madness for Germany and could have only one outcome. Statement. that the war could have been won if there had been no betrayal and sabotage is refuted by the facts cited above. Even if we admit that sabotage really took place, then even then we will have to admit that it could hasten the losses of the war, but was not the main reason for our defeat. It is said that the saboteurs belonging to the opposition did everything in their power to hasten the destruction of Germany. They say that they interfered with the production of weapons and ammunition and gave sabotage orders, maintained contact with the enemy, and in every possible way hampered the sending of reinforcements to the front. But all the literature on the resistance movement, including the works of hostile writers, does not contain any

one piece of evidence that sabotage had ever been carried out at the front. Separate cases took place shortly before the start of the war. at the beginning of the campaign in France and in the last months of the war, when members of the resistance movement established political contacts with the enemy. This is all". This quote from a top manager of CJSK Europe is presented here as a transition to the next research topic:

World War II. Reboot

"Resistance Movement in Europe". Vel if you carry out the usual conversion of terms. associated with the transition to the opposite point of view, changing "vile spies" to "brave scouts", then the "traitors and saboteurs" mentioned above by Speer are those figures of the Resistance, "whose contribution to the general ..." or let's say, whose "help" to the Soviet Victory we are trying to evaluate. The first assessment of the interrogated Reichsminister: <... so, they didn't particularly annoy. And he, Speer, already vigorously and categorically refutes the hypothesis of the "decisive contribution of the saboteurs".

But the importance of the topic does not allow us to confine ourselves to this assessment. In a huge historical layer, we will certainly find other, perhaps even opposite, assessments. This one, Speer's, is important precisely as a general systemic view, the view of a person who has dealt only with the macroeconomic problems of the United Europe. The potential of countries, industries, building optimal connections, communication routes and damage from bombing, captures and losses of deposits... in general, from these heights, the "Resistance" was barely visible, more precisely. imperceptibly.

Another top manager, Chief of the General Staff of the Wehrmacht, General Halder:

"My commander-in-chief and I opposed Hitler whenever it was necessary to prevent him from accepting a decision that. in our opinion, it was unprofitable for Germany and the army. But everything that the troops needed to carry out their difficult and difficult tasks was always sent to the front. In the fight against Hitler, we never took actions that could cause any harm to our troops at the front.

They spoke. that during the last months of the war no reinforcements arrived, that the equipment laid down for the infantry was sent to the tank divisions, and the infantry received fuel. intended for tank units. Anyone

123 Igor Shumeiko

who was at the front at that time, the reasons for this situation will become clear. In the last months of the war, our communications were so disrupted that it was virtually impossible to ensure the delivery of replacements to their destination. The commanders of the battle groups took into their own hands everything that followed through the areas where their troops were located. We knew very well that reinforcements, military equipment and fuel destined for the front were also delayed by the Gauleiters. who used all this for their own parts of the Volkssturm.

This is an answer to another hypothesis: "Were the interruptions in the supply of the front in recent months the merit of any organization of the Resistance, any of the two "Chapels"?"

"It remains to clarify our attitude to the events of June 20, 1944 - the assassination attempt on Hitler. Personally, I learned about this from a message transmitted by radio; at that time we were engaged in heavy defensive battles in the region of Lvov. We were all literally stunned when we learned that a German officer was able to carry out an assassination attempt and, most importantly, at a time when the soldiers on the Eastern Front were fighting to the death, trying to stop the advance of the Russian troops. We were well aware of the abuses committed by the leaders of the "brown shirts", especially the "Reich Commissars", as well as the arrogant behavior of these people and the crimes of the leaders of the special detachments (Einsatzgruppi) of the SS, although we rarely felt the presence of these people near the front. suspicious individuals. Party leaders were not very popular at the front. During periods of calm, many expressed their dissatisfaction

behavior of these "gentlemen", and everyone said that this should be dealt with immediately after the end of the war. Nevertheless, the front-line soldiers - and we, the officers of the General Staff in the troops, are proud to be among them - were outraged when they heard about the assassination attempt; the soldier at the front had done his duty to the very end. Only during the imprisonment in the camp

World War II. Reboot

we learned in more detail about what caused the assassination attempt on Hitler. I must admit that the people responsible for this were guided by lofty ideals and a deep consciousness of their responsibility for the fate of our country. Colonel Count Staufenberg and his associates from the OKH were aware that the Hitler regime would lead Germany to disaster. They deeply believed that the elimination of Hitler would save Germany from further bloodshed. But if the attempt on Hitler's life had succeeded, it would have led to a bloody internal feud with the SS troops. In foreign policy, this would not lead to any success either. The enemy decided to pursue a policy of "unconditional surrender" regardless of whether or not there would be a National Socialist government in Germany. With such a policy, Roosevelt only strengthened the will to resist every German and thereby made the same mistake as the German political leaders in Russia, who did not see the difference between the Communists and the Russian people. If the attempt on Hitler's life had succeeded, all Germans would have blamed the catastrophe on our officer corps and especially on the German General Staff. In any case, we should not forget that the war was lost by non-participants in the conspiracy of July 20, 1944.

The death penalty for a variety of manifestations of disobedience (such as the spread of hostile rumors), declared as part of the "total war", increased the atmosphere of terror in the rear, but could not save the Nazi regime. If during the First World War in Germany, 50 people were executed for state crimes, then in the years of the Second - about 30 thousand. In the memorandums of the SD, intended for the top leadership of the Third Reich, special attention was paid to the defeatist mood that gripped young people of pre-conscription age. Alternative associations began to spontaneously arise in the largest cities semi-criminal youth,

16 Igor Shumeiko

calling themselves "pirates". The fermentation of the rear gradually began to embrace the army, the introduction of the position of an officer, but the national socialist education did not compensate for the decline in the morale of the soldiers. The super-total mobilization carried out in July 1944 gave only 300 thousand new soldiers, although more than a million were needed to simply compensate for the Wehrmacht's human losses.

The attached portrait of the European manager

It is worth saying a few more words about the second and last Minister Kasbztaiyegit @e Wayae and pa Mipyup. Mainly because in the book "Inside the Third Reich" published in 1970 by Albert Speer, in addition to a huge amount of facts AND "exclusive" observations, there are one, almost passing remark, very important for our "doss".

"Inside the Third Reich" is recognized as "the most outstanding political memoir of all time." Speer wrote it in the fortress-prison of Spandau, while serving a 20-year sentence under a sentence he received in Nuremberg. He wrote secretly, passing "to the will" and a piece of paper.

And at the 1946 International Military Tribunal itself, Speer drew attention on two points: 1) he, the only one of all the accused, pleaded guilty for the crimes of the Third Reich: "This trial is necessary, in an authoritarian system for such terrible crimes everyone bears common responsibility." 2) he was the only one who had a definite personal relationship with Adolf Hitler. Thanks to this point, Albert Speer was not only the defendant in Nuremberg, but also the most "demanded" witness. It is clear that behind the bench of the tribunal towered,

the figure of the Fuhrer loomed large. Scientists, historians and psychologists, primarily Western ones, wanted to somehow explain, rationalize, isolate the "Psychological

World War II. Reboot 127

logical prerequisites. Albert generally did not recoil from this role, stating: "It seems to me that if Hitler could ever have a friend, that friend would be me." It was known that the Fuhrer, being himself a failed architect, saw in Speer the embodiment of his own youthful dreams. It is also recorded that Hitler stood for hours chained to Schnpeer's sketches and models. In 1938, he presented him with the Golden Party Badge.

Speer was born on March 15, 1905 in Mannheim. Studied architecture, was an assistant at the Berlin Technical Institute. In 1931 he joined the NSDAP, and in 1932 he joined the SS. He was a member of several minor architectural commissions for the construction of the headquarters of the Gau Leiter Berlin, then he was entrusted with the technical support of the gigantic party congress in Tempelhof | May 1933. Speer's masterful use of quick-erect flagpoles and unusual lighting effects gave Nazi mass gatherings a distinctively pompous style. In 1934, he was assigned to develop a project for arranging a site for party congresses in Nuremberg.

Here I must make a minor clarification. Everyone repeats: "Architect, architect..." And in this chapter I myself combined Speer with the builder Todt, trying to deduce a certain regularity. BUT, strictly speaking, at the moment when the Fuhrer approached him, Speer did not build, did not design buildings. The design of congresses, parades, pavilions is a completely different sphere, albeit a related one. (In modern Russia, this is done by the famous designer Krasnov.) It was only much later that Speer received architectural commissions from Hitler. It turns out that the case of Speer, as well as the unprecedented impromptu with the conqueror of Norway, General Falkenhorst (von Jast Rzhembsky). analyzed by us in Chapter 13 is a manifestation of a certain intuition of Hitler.

"... He brought a capable architect closer to him, appointed him head of the department of the German Labor

[128] | Igor Shumeiko

front and introduced his deputy to the headquarters. In 1937, Speer became the Chief Inspector of the Reich for Architecture, with the task of "making Berlin again the real and true capital of the German Reich." Realizing the grandiose ideas of Hitler, Speer worked tirelessly: he designed state institutions, stadiums, palaces, monuments and entire super-cities for the future Greater Germany. Nscheer openly expressed admiration for the ideas of his patron, which other architects called "crazy sentimentality"; fit for the past

century."

In 1941, Speer was elected to the Reichstag. Ace of 1942, he is the Minister of Armaments and the Military Industry in place of Frin Todt, who died in a plane crash. Speer was also a member of the central planning commission, general inspector of water resources and energy, director of the Todt Organization, head of the National Socialist Corps of Drivers, and head of the party's main technological department. For some time he was considered the second man in the Third Reich and the undisputed dictator of the German military industry. He achieved extraordinary production results despite opposition from other Nazi leaders and despite heavy casualties from Allied bombing. In the last weeks of the war, he resisted Hitler's orders to carry out the "scorched earth" tactics.

In his testimony, Speer claimed that his activities were "technological and economic" and not political, that he was only an architect, and that all he knew about what was happening was what he could read in newspapers. But he admitted that he rejected cruelty, not from a humanitarian point of view, but from a practical point of view, since excessive cruelty would be a hindrance in his efforts to increase production. Tribunal limited

World War II. Reboot

by admitting Speer's "complicity" in the forced labor program: "It was recognized as a mitigating circumstance that ... in the final stages of the war, he was one of the few who had the courage to tell Hitler that the war was lost and prevent wanton destruction of industrial enterprises". Speer was found guilty on count 3 (war crimes) and count 4 (crimes against humanity). | October [1946] he was sentenced to 20 years in the Schzandau prison in Berlin. Os freed himself, as we would say. "on call", in 1966. This is also an interesting fact, considering that hundreds of German generals were released after 3-5 years.

Now back to Speer's book "Inside the Third Reich". "...the most outstanding political memoir of all time. The book demonstrates how Hitler's unlimited power was able to combine with the new mechanism provided by modern technology. But for the purposes of our study, I make one very important observation from Speer's memoirs and ask you to recall it in the chapter "And how many columns there were." It seems to me that there is and will continue to develop in the politically correct works of scientists from the United Europe (Brussels) the idea that the previous United Europe (Berlin) was a kind of monolith, a crystal of Hitler's unlimited will. Behind this "monolith" lies the responsibility and even the economic interest of countries like France, Belgium, the Czech Republic, and Holland. They write about the "cruel orders of the Fuhrer", but there were also "orders" (probably with a prepayment). Here Speer writes that:

"The Third Reich was in fact very far from a monolithic totalitarian state, but was only a fragmented feudal principality controlled by local politicians. Each defended his own personal interests and sought his own benefit, not caring about the cost of the war.

130 Igor Shumeiko

, Hymn to the Technocrats

Speer's principle of "industry's self-responsibility", and most importantly, the innovative planning system he developed (which to a large extent included in modern management theory) became one of the main successes of Germany in that war. But even the most indisputable successes of the Reich Minister of Armaments did not save him from the intrigues of Goering, Himmler, and most of all, Bormann. Speer recalls how he once brought Hitler the issue of the English newspaper The Observer for April 9, 1944. Hitler put on his glasses and sat down to read.

““In a sense, Speer is more important for Germany today than Hitler, Himmler. Goering, Goebbels or even generals. Somehow it so happened that they began to work in the wings of this man, who really ensures the operation of a giant engine and squeezes the maximum possible out of it. His example is a pure example of the managerial revolution. Schneer is not one of those operetta-painterly Nazis who are always in sight. In general, it is not clear whether he has any other than the most common political convictions. He could easily join any party that would provide him with a job and a career. This is a pronounced type of successful average person - well-dressed, polite, unsaleable. And according to the way of life of the family (wife and six children) - typically the middle class. To a much lesser extent than any other of the German leaders, he is reminiscent of something German or typically National Socialist. He most likely embodies the type that is increasingly beginning to play an important role in all warring countries - a pure techie who does not belong to any class. a brilliant man without a noble birth, who has no other goal than to break through, relying on his technical and organizational abilities. It is the absence of psi

World War II. Reboot

chological and spiritual ballast and the ease with which he handles. terrible mechanism of our age, allows it to advance so far... We can get rid of the Hitlers and Himmlers, but the Speers will be among us."

Hitler carefully read to the end, folded the paper in half and silently gave it to me with some reverence."

In almost the same words (believe me, we will save space in this book) Speer himself describes Wernher von Braun's team of technocrats.

"I had an intention to establish mass production of consumer goods in France, Belgium, Holland: clothes, shoes, textiles, furniture, in order to reorient enterprises of a similar profile in Germany to military products ... I invited the French colleague in Berlin. Bichelonne Minister. professor at the Sorbonne, had a reputation as an extremely capable and energetic person. Not without some wrangling with the Foreign Ministry, I managed to get him accepted as a guest of the German government. On September 17 I received Bichelonne, with whom I had almost friendly relations. We were both young, we believed that the future belongs to us... I was ready to cancel the territorial robbery of France... all the more so, in my opinion, it is not so important where the state borders in Europe lie, if connected together by joint production.

The key issue that day was the deportation of labor force from France to Germany (up to 50,000 people per month).

Bichelonne disregarded the instructions of Laval (French Prime Minister), I of Sauckel. The agreed plan was beneficial for both parties... Factories removed from Sauckel's practice of forcible mobilization of labor were identified, which was announced by letters of protection signed by me personally... in the end, all the leading enterprises were outside Sauckel's sphere number in ten you

132 Igor Shumeiko

thousand... Instead of 50,000, less than 5,000 people began to be deported. | On March 1944, Sauckel reported with irritation: "My services report that everything has come to an end. In all the prefectures it is the same: Minister Bichelonne has concluded an agreement with Minister Speer..."

Admit it: in these descriptions United (by Hitler) Europe and United Europe-2 (current) are simply indistinguishable. The same spirit of optimization, calculation, cooperation.

Only a small touch is missing: for Speer to transfer his Ministry (KesiSpiti"epit Fe UaNe ipa Milyup) to Brussels, the capital of the current European technocrats.

This means that the balance needs to be clarified: among the opponents of the USSR then were not only fanatics like Hitler, Sauckel, Goebbels, but also European top managers.

Chapter 10 Of the property transferred to the trust management (and a little about public order during the transfer)

In order to present the full scale of the Czech-Hitler cooperation, it is appropriate to give a general idea of the power of at least one or two Czech enterprises.

The history of the Škoda concern began in 1859: Count Wallenstein-Wartenberg founded foundries and machine-building factories in the city of Pilsen, producing equipment for sugar mills, breweries, mines, steam engines and boilers, elements of metal bridges and railway structures . In 1869, the engineer and entrepreneur Emil Skoda (Ety \$Koda), whose name became a trademark, became the owner of the factory.

In the 1880s, Škoda was Europe's foremost foundry and metalworking enterprise, whose products were used for the most iconic objects of the 20th century: power plants on the Niagara Falls, locks on the Suez Canal. During the First World War, Škoda, the largest arms manufacturer in Austria-Hungary, supplied heavy guns and ammunition for the army and navy.

In 1917, the factories in Pilsen alone had 35,000 workers. Skoda, one of the firms, provided

15-4 | Igor Shumeiko

Czechoslovakia is the world's largest exporter of arms, supplies them to South America and Asia, to the Far Eastern countries.

In 1925, the Gail & Yvetel automobile company became part of Skoda. about which the following should be said. In 1895, Laurin (Vasjau Gainl) and Klement (Vaslay KMetel!) founded the production of bicycles "Slavia" (Zla\va). And 4 years later, in 1899. Gail & KMetel { made the decision to move from bicycles to motorcycles, which became an instant hit. This decision quickly made the company famous, thanks to the performance of new motorcycles in various international competitions. In 1905, the first Mopigüey A car came off, like the first motorcycles, which was a huge success. It was "Wokigetse A" that won for 1 & K. a stable position in the developing international car market. In 1907, thanks to the gradually expanding production, which went beyond the family business, Ggail & Yutele founded a joint-stock company. In 1911, the car model "53" with a 14 hp engine was put into production. It became the most popular model of the firm before World War I, not only in the country, but also abroad. Branches of the firm were established in St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kyiv and Rostov. Large consignments of cars were sold to Japan, China, Australia, Mexico, Germany and England.

But in addition to cars and trucks, the company at different times produced aircraft engines and aircraft, racing cars, stationary electricity generators, road rollers and much more, which is truly an unusual phenomenon for car companies.

During the First World War, the company's activities were focused on the production of military equipment. technology.

World War II. Reboot 155

Further development of the automotive industry: the model "Skoda Monte Carlo" (1935) received its name in honor of the victory at the Monte Carlo Rally.

In 1939, the AZAR ZKoda company became part of the German industrial group Negtapp Soenia-UMegKe (Hermann Goering Werke) and switched to the production of military products. On the basis of "Skoda Superb", "Skoda 900" off-road vehicles for the army were produced. Gas generator trucks, heavy caterpillar tractors (KO - Kanrepssherreg 0%, "Vostok" crawling tractor). In August 1940, with the permission of the German authorities, Skoda sold Hungary a license to manufacture the T-22.

The re-entry of Skoda in 1991 into the German concern was completely peaceful. And it was no longer Negtapp-Soeppr-VerKe, but Wok5\arep Ogochr.

Wrong will be those who suspect the Skoda team of complete irresponsibility and moral indifference to the consequences of THEIR "work". Here is a fragment from the official history of the plant.

"In February 1934, Skoda presented the military leadership of the country with a model of the Ts light tank, and in the spring it made its prototype. The tank had armor from 8 to 15 mm and developed a speed of up to 30 km per hour, the cruising range was 150 km.

By the end of the tests of the first model, Skoda had developed an improved model Š-P-a (Š - ZKoda I - light tank, a - designed for cavalry) with armor, hull and turret increased to 25 mm thick. 37-mm guns were installed on the tanks, which were produced by the same Skoda. Until 1939, the Skoda plant produced 295 tanks.

Unfortunately, after the occupation of Czechoslovakia, its tanks were included in the German fascist units and participated in the capture of Poland. France, in the war against the Soviet Union. The last tank of Czech production was destroyed on December 10, 1941 during the liberation of the city of Klin near Moscow.

| Igor Shumeiko

Some tanks with turrets removed were used as coastal defense artillery tractors in Denmark ... "

What can be added here? The Skoda team has a moral responsibility, but it, like their tanks, is "light and medium". Here, they write, they fired 295 tanks, unfortunately, they hit Hitler, but by December 10, 1941, they were finished, and it was documented that they did not go further than the city of Klin near Moscow. That is, responsibility is recognized for tanks riveted in the 30s. And six years of uninterrupted production of new tanks, guns, trucks and other military equipment is, in general, not our history, but the history of the Neglatl Soeppr-UeKe concern ... But the fact that the old "stock of tanks ran out by [December 0, 1941 years" - this is the most common practice, the reality of that war. The "expenditure" of the German T-P itself would be about the same, and there is no reason to consider December 10 a holiday - the Day of the end of responsibility for tanks...

During the war, Skoda produced the German light tank Px Krýh-35.

All special encyclopedias call the best, among the light and medium tanks of the Wehrmacht, another model - Rg Krokh-38, the manufacturer is the VMM concern. This VMM is the former (before 1939) another well-known ČKD-Prague plant. And the R7 Krým-38x tank (really a very successful model) is a Czech TMNR-Š tank, exported to Iran, Sweden, Switzerland, and Romania. Immediately after the annexation of the Czech Republic, the Wehrmacht ordered 350 vehicles, and a total of 411 units were manufactured (according to other sources - 1300).

And briefly about the history and potential of the ČHKD plant itself. Its full name is "Czech Moravian Kolben Danek", it appeared in 1927 as a result of the merger of the companies "First Czech Moravian Machine-Building Factory", "Kolben and Companions", "Danek and Companions".

The "First Bohemian-Moravian Engineering Factory" was founded in the 1870s

World War II. Reboot HER

titelnyh and chemical shops and structures made of steel, larovoz, wagons. In 1907, together with the Ringhoffer company, he created the PRAGUE company for the production of cars and trucks.

Kolben and Companions was founded in 1896 by Emil Kolben, an employee of Edison himself, the chief engineer of Edvol SE Co. Produces hydro turbines, equipment for hydroelectric power stations.

At the formation of "CHKD" staff - 12,000 people. In the 1930s, the output of military products was constantly growing. During the occupation, most of the production was transferred to the supplies of the German army. As a result of the Allied air attack in March 1945, about 70% of the buildings and 50% of the machinery were damaged.

All of the above is only a small part and only of the Czech-Moravian armored registry. Dig further and can't get away from the mention of the amazing Czech tank GT-38, on the basis of which the engineers of the MBB (former Praga plants) and Skoda developed the Merder self-propelled gun, and, as is recognized, the best anti-tank self-propelled gun of that war "Hertzer". Its circulation of 2584 copies is an "excellent result" for this genre.

What else is important to say about the nature of relations in that "United Europe" of 1938-1945? The level of Hitler's violence—perhaps, there will still be plenty of attempts to even exaggerate it in order to hide behind it, to hide a share, a slice of completely market relations. It was in Auschwitz and Majdanek that shackles rang, and in "United Europe" coins rang. Denmark, Norway, the Czech Republic, France received not only orders, but also orders. And the perspective, the "Great Plan". Hitler describes this to his closest associates:

"Führer's Table Talk. October 13, 1941:

Those countries that we invite to participate in our economic system will have their share of natural

138 | Igor Shumeiko

wealth of Russian regions. On an economic level, America will never partner with European countries. The Danube is the river of the future. We will connect it with the Dnieper and the Don. Europe, not America, will become a country of unlimited possibilities... And Ukrainian manganese is also important for America."

That is, the Fuhrer, speaking in a modern way, nevertheless "was a marketer." Even to his most insignificant contractors, he showed not only the stick, but also the carrot.

Indirect evidence, and even taken from some unexpected areas, is good because it is fundamentally unfalsifiable. They seem to inadvertently give a picture, or rather, the very edge of the picture, but the accustomed eye will finish the rest.

Approximately the same is meant by Plutarch in his immortal "Comparative Lives", in the introduction to "Alexander the Great":

"... and it is not always in the most glorious deeds that virtue or viciousness is visible, but often some insignificant deed, word or joke reveals the character of a person better than battles where tens of thousands die ..."

How do I understand that the violence was not absolute, but conditional, carefully groping for acceptable levels?

The Fuhrer issued a series of anti-Jewish laws, instructions requiring, in particular, to remove all monuments to Jews in the Reich. There was a monument to the composer Mendelssohn in Leipzig, and Burgomaster Gerderleo forbade it to be removed. He, the burgomaster, enjoyed great respect in the city, so the Nazis did not dare to dismiss him. And the monument stood. But one day Herderleo went on vacation and briefly left Leipzig. And his deputy immediately ordered the removal of Mendelssohn.

Returning, the burgomaster ordered the re-installation of the mint. And then it followed: the removal of Gerderleo from his post, sending him to a concentration camp, and then the execution. (Nua monument, of course, was thrown down again on the first day.) Here they are, different degrees of violence. Violence trial opre

World War II. Reboot

dividing, looking for its boundaries: burgomaster. supported by the total. authority of the city of Leipzig, could not remove the monument to the Jew. But he could no longer raise.

The second example is about German politeness. More specifically, about the greeting, Hitler's salute.

If anyone looks into the "Directive on the Hitler salute", he will know that, it turns out, there were two different "Heils!"

"When meeting persons belonging to the same social group, it is recommended to raise the outstretched right hand at such an angle that the face can be seen from under the palm. This gesture should be accompanied by the words "Heil Hitler/" or at least "Heil/". If someone greets a friend from a greater distance, it is enough to raise their hand in the manner described.

If a person is encountered who, from a social or other point of view, is lower, one should raise the right hand vertically at eye level and at the same time say: "Heil Hitler /" "

This "below from a social or other point of view" is very interesting. Other, not public - this is meant from a racial "point of view below." That is, a separate form of saluting the French, Dutch, etc. was also provided.

And this is also indirect evidence of the presence of accounting records? in the Third Reich.

Chapter 11 The main "Munich" Czech. stories

Anyone who looked at European maps of different eras. he remembers a large country in the very center of Europe, whose outlines resembled the stretched skin of some animal. It was usually shaded in gray tones, sometimes green. Although the outlines and names changed: the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the famous "patchwork empire of the Habsburgs". Czech Republic, the main economic engine of the empire, in the name, in the "title" is not never hit.

If we move along this complex historical dotted line: Soviet tanks in Prague 1968 - Czech tanks in Russia - 1941/44 - "The Shame of Munich" - First Czechoslovakia... and at the same time try to comprehend some patterns of Czech history, all the same, you will inevitably run into the Habsburg Empire and, further, into the Holy Roman Empire.

So, Charlemagne was the first to reproduce the Ancient Roman (Western) Empire approximately within the old borders, but already in the Christian world. By 924, the empire had actually collapsed on its own, the Saxon Hernog Otto revived it in 962. Czecho-Moravia is an indispensable and more and more powerful member of this motley community. Dynasties of emperors changed: Saxon, Salices

World War II. Reboot

kaya. Hohenstaufen ... The dynastic principle was successfully combined with the election of the emperor. The board of these electors, Electors, included five to seven major princes of the empire. The Habsburgs at that time —let's put it this way: petty, petty landowners. And not in the South-Eastern (where Austria) corner of the empire, but in the South-West (where Alsace is). Built in the upper reaches of the Rhine in about 1020-1040, the "Hawk Castle" (Hamschlerge, Habichtsburg - later transferred to Habsburg) was not included in the "first hundred" princely castles of the empire. When the last of the Hohenstaufen died, the most likely candidate was the Czech king Ishemysl Otokar II. "King of iron and gold", so called for military power and wealth. he also owned parts of Hungary, Croatia and Slovenia. Having annexed Austria in 1250, Przemysl Otokar II became the most powerful monarch, the undisputed "leader" of the empire, and his personal possessions surprisingly resembled the outlines of the country from which the Habsburgs would remain under the horses of their history in 1918.

But here's an even more unique coincidence. The history of the Czech Republic in our country is divided and decomposed into such different shelves that such a comparison has never been discussed before.

"War Munich" to Przemysl Otokar III!

It looks a bit like shouting in a bar... "Double Munich! "Double Manhattan!" " — but the originality of this subtitle does not obscure the fidelity of this historical parallel. Munich is understandable. since 1938, synonymous with dirty betrayal. But "Double"? Pshe thought Otokar II was betrayed twice. At first, in 1273, his fellow electors did not elect him emperor.

12 Igor Shumeiko

rum. Many promised, but ... in the end, it was the power of the Czech that scared them. On the contrary, they chose the weakest of the candidates, Rudolf Habsburg the First. Everyone called that option intermediate. Something similar happens in the election of the popes, when the cardinals reach a dead end and choose the oldest of the candidates in order to "return to the question" soon.

But Rudolf Habsburg turned out to be just a unique figure, the founder of a dynasty that lasted 650 years. (Napoleon, in moments of intoxication with his dynastic plans, said: "I myself am Rudolf the First Habsburg of my dynasty.")

But what about the "second Munich" of Przemysl II?

Ask any of the historians about the most significant battle in the history of the Czech Republic - and 99% will name the Battle of the White Mountain, 1620. The beginning of the Thirty Years' War and the end of Czech independence - this era will also be touched upon.

But what happened in 1278 deserves more attention. A kind of unique betrayal, ingrained in the very fabric of Czech history.

The Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire was an honorary figure (the main monarch of the Christian world), but often completely powerless. Weaker than many of his actually independent vassals, relying mainly on his personal possessions - and Rudolf was chosen precisely for the modesty of such. But Rudolph decided to go to war with Ishemysl Otokar, and on August 26, 1278, this amazing battle took place on the Moravian field. The most powerful army of Ishemysl could have defeated Rudolf, but the traitorous conspirators killed their commander in chief, and the Czech army dispersed. Believe me, in correct European, non-Asian wars, this is the rarest case. The Przemyslov dynasty soon came to an end, but the main thing is that the Habsburgs received their main "historical base", Austria, Vienna. And the first land where the conquering

World War II. Reboot

the view of the Habsburgs - of course the Czech Republic. True, the streak of their first successes soon ended, the "spiral of history" made many more turns before the Habsburgs got the Czech Republic. The descendants of Rudolph for a long historical period also lost the imperial crown. For all 650 years of historical pulsations, Austria, taken from Przemysl, was the only one that firmly belonged to them.

For the Czechs, there was another period of intellectual and military "pan-European" take-off. We are talking, of course, about Jan Hus (high intellectual, religious, moral impulse) and his Hussites (military). And then it all ended with Munich, Munich...

"Munich" of the 15th century was located in Konstanje – Jan Hus was summoned there to the first cathedral with all written guarantees of immunity, letters, including those from Emperor Sigismund of Luxembourg (so Chamberlain's guarantees have a rich background)! The theological disputes were short-lived: Jan Hus was captured and on July 6, 1415, burned at the stake.

So much has been said about the famous Hussites, "Taborites", who boldly and successfully resisted the aggression of almost all of Europe ... One can only add that even in the middle of the 20th century, Soviet boys played "Taborites". (The author himself was a witness and participant, building a "Wagenburg" from carts and vegetable boxes.)

Seemingly invincible, the Taborites fell victim to the intrigues of Sigismund, the pope, and, mainly, the Bohemian German nobles and townspeople (a pure analogue of the "Sudet Germans" of 1938). At Lipany in 1436, the Czechs were already fighting among themselves. And the result: the traitor of Hus, long rejected by the whole of the Czech Republic, Sigismund Luxembourg, returns as king to Prague...

Let's not adjust the story to fit the scheme: after the Konstanz and Lipan "Munich" the Hussites were able to present Europe with one big surprise, comparable to the Taborites' triumfal campaigns throughout Europe (and about this in

E Igor Shumeiko

our popular historiography almost complete silence). Suddenly, the almost destroyed Hussites nominated a new leader: George (Yury) Podebrad, and he within a few years: captured Prague in 1448, became regent, and in 1458 - king (the first and only Hussite king in the Czech Republic). A unique personality in Medieval Europe and the only commoner to achieve kingship, forcing pope and emperor to recognize himself and intermarrying with several royal houses...

Once again, the Czech Republic came to the forefront of history during the first of the great pan-European wars. The famous Thirty Years' War (1618-1648) and the Peace of Westphalia that ended it opened the era in which we are believed to live today. The very idea of "national sovereignties" has a precisely defined date of birth - October 24, 1648, the day of the signing of the Peace of Westphalia.

III AMAZING INQUIRIES Why was there a lot of talk about the Westphalian period in 1999?

But because Clinton and Madeleine Albright, while starting a war against Serbia, tried to substantiate it fundamentally new in international law: "The primacy of "universal values" over national sovereignty." It was then that international lawyers started talking about a possible "end of the Westphalian period" and the beginning of some new period in history. And the fact that today those "universal values" are remembered no more often than the "blue dress of Monica Lewinsky" (and approximately in similar tones) shows the seriousness, non-randomness of the "Westphalian" turn of human history.

This important war in the history of mankind is divided by scientists into 4 periods, depending on the main rival of the Habsburgs at that time:

1. Czech 2. Danish 3. Swedish 4. French.

World War II. Reboot

The Thirty Years' War began in Prague, when the Czechs refused to recognize another Habsburg as heir to the Czech throne. And on May 22, 1618, the rebellious people subjected the imperial governors to the "Czech execution" - defenestration. (Defenestration, execution by throwing out of a window, is a Czech invention. Apparently, this is connected with the success of multi-storey construction in Prague.)

The Czechs elected their king, the Protestant Frederick of the Palatinate, but in 1620, in the same battle at the White Mountain, they were defeated and lost their independence for 300 years! Here is the irony! The Thirty Years' War gave independence to the Netherlands, Switzerland and almost fifty German principalities, but the Czechs, who started this great struggle, on the contrary, took it away!

Only the collapse of the Habsburg Empire in 1918 and the creation of Czechoslovakia restored the sovereignty of this nation...

What the world remembers in 1938 as an unimaginable kaleidoscope of diplomatic intrigues and soundings of Halifax, Ciano and Bonnet, political statements and denials of Beneš,

Chamberlain and Daladier, throwing from Moscow to Washington - Hitler called it briefly: Plan "Grun".

After the Anschluss of Austria, Czechoslovakia may have looked on the maps as a defenseless, semi-encircled country. But this is only for those who like looking at the "political maps of Europe" alone. Anyone who takes the trouble to look into physical maps will be convinced that the brown places between the Czech Republic and Germany are not from the "brown plague of fascism". These are mountains. Border ranges Sumava, Bohemian Forest, Ore Mountains, Sudetenland. In conscience, they can not be called impassable. The last (before Munich - 1938) who broke through these ridges was Moltke the Elder, who defeated the Austro-Hungarians in 1866 (and non-titular, mostly ordinary

composition

| Igor Shumeiko

Czechs) in the Battle of Sadovaya. BUT the twentieth century has made its own adjustments. The main thing is that the Czechs have strengthened. It was the combination of the mountainous terrain and modern fortifications that made it possible to create this unique line, immeasurably superior to all those famous Maginots and Siegfrieds. The second factor: in the Wehrmacht in 1938, the main stake was placed on tank and motorized units. But what gave advantages on the fields of Poland and France was, on the contrary, a significant disadvantage in the Ore and Sudeten Mountains. We remember the conclusion of the German generals, who later studied the Czech fortifications: "Never, neither during the entry of German troops into the Rhineland and the Ruhr area, nor during the Anschluss of Austria, nor even during the attack on Polotsa in 1939 and on France in 1940 -m - there has never been such a risk of defeat. Partly the Czech mountain fortifications were impregnable, partly they required more than half a year of assault and completely different artillery to break through.

It is known from the testimony at the Nuremberg trials that the German generals categorically objected to Hitler's plan to break through the Sudeten fortifications, since this task seemed to them militarily impossible. Wilhelm Keitel testified: "We were extraordinarily glad that things did not go as far as a military operation, because ... we have always been of the opinion that our offensive means are not enough to storm the border installations of Czechoslovakia. From a purely military point of view, we simply did not have the means for an attack that would break like a wave against a breakwater of the border fortifications in the Sudetes.

Now to find out why this most perfect defensive system was never tested in practice?

The main political tool for breaking Czechoslovakia was the Sudeten Germans led by Henlein.

World War II. Reboot 147

tsy". As you can easily guess, they lived in the Sudeten mountains. And that is why all the talk (mostly English) about the possibility of transferring these areas of Germany "in exchange for peace and guarantees" is a very special level of cynicism and betrayal. Hitler assembled in the Sudetenland an obedient political leadership, whose leader Konrad Henlein defined his task as follows: "We must always demand so much that our demands cannot be satisfied."

Henlein demanded that the municipal elections scheduled for May 22, 1938 be counted as a referendum on joining Germany. The President of Czechoslovakia, Benes, announced a partial mobilization, and the May crisis passed quite happily for the Czechs. Henlein fled to Germany.

(An interesting fact came across to me in Helmut's World History of Mankind, Russian edition of 1904: earlier the Sudetsky Mountains were called "Giant Mountains". More precisely, then

Sudetes, and Giants. Later there was a union under the first of the names. It turns out that the controversial national minority can also be called ... "Giant Germans".)

The next stage of pressure can be considered the trip of Hitler's personal adjutant Wiedemann to London and his negotiations with the head of the Foreign Office, Lord Halifax. This was followed by meetings of the Fuhrer himself with Prime Minister Chamberlain.

Why were the British treated in the first place? Czechoslovakia had a mutual assistance agreement with France and the USSR, and the French asked for British assistance in persuading the Czechs to cede the Sudetenland. Wiedemann left some interesting notes (published in English as *Riuzhe Raregs*, they are in the US Library of Congress). So, the British "wait and believe": big negotiations will finally appease Hitler, "canalize" the energy and dynamics of the Reich.

Wiedemann: "The Fuhrer will go to full-scale negotiations with Great Britain and conclude a long-term agreement -

148 | Igor Shumeiko

but only after the resolution of the Central European problem (the annexation of the Sudetenland, as follows from the context of the conversation).

Halifax: "Tell him (the Fuhrer) I hope to live to see the main goal of my efforts come true: to see Adolf Hitler with the King of England on the balcony of Buckingham Palace"

What pathos! Here, in my opinion, there is room even for purely Freudian studies. This exit to the "balcony". As you know, the main, central love scene in the plot of Shakespeare's play "Romeo and Juliet" is the famous "scene on the balcony". Yiu of a lord brought up on Shakespeare could have been deposited with images... Etc.

Wiedemann retells Halifax's ideas this way: "Bombs on Prague are war. We need a different tactic in Czechoslovakia. No shots needed - choke them."

Of course, it is too big a responsibility to rely on a question of such importance (the diplomatic strategy of Great Britain in 1938) only on Wiedemann's notes. But here is the opinion of Dirksen, the German ambassador in London: "The British wanted to resolve the issue in stages: from autonomy to plebiscite, from plebiscite to secession (Sudet). But provided that there are no violent acts of Germany disturbing public opinion."

SH AMAZING INQUIRIES And who, exactly?

And who, in fact, betrayed the Czech Republic? Britain or the British Chamberlain government? In other cases, dividing the country and the government is pure sophistry, but right there, clearly, at every step, one can see fears of the most terrible thing for Halifax - the fall of the cabinet, the resignation. "The first bomb - and the war." That is, it went down

World War II. Reboot

intermediate link: the first bomb - and ... the arrival of Churchill (a year earlier), and then, indeed, the war (he will not stand on ceremony and draw "scene under the balcony"! Only this "first bomb" was necessary rice - whip ...

Dirksen's colleague, Newton, the British ambassador in Prague, adds historical conceptualization: "Czechoslovakia is an artificial creation that has no roots in the past." And, as is probably implied, "having no right to the future."

There is no need to remind once again about the measure of influence in Britain and the world of the London newspaper The Times. And here is a photocopy of her issue dated September 7, 1938 with an article by the then chief

editor Dawson should be in every Czech museum:

"We recommend accepting proposals whose aim is to make the Czech Republic a more homogeneous state, by separating from it a population alien to it, living in the neighborhood of a people with which it is connected by racial ties."

The official statement of Lonlon on September 18, 1938: "It is necessary to give (to Germany) those areas where the Germans are more than 50% of the total population. Without this, guarantees for Chechnya within its new borders are impossible." It is perfectly complemented by the admission the next day (September 19) of the British Minister of War Hore-Belish: "We have no means of fulfilling our guarantees." (Be brave, Adolf!)

The British Ambassador in London (this is already a kind of RE-arrangement): "If excuses are needed before certain circles, who regard this as a shameful capitulation to German threats, then this can be explained by our constant adherence to the principle of self-determination of nations."

The final assessment - albeit not the most senior person, just the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs

Igor Shumeiko

Early Affairs (Halifax) O. Harvey: "In fact, we presented an ultimatum to the Czechs for Germany."

On September 22, Goji's agrarian government resigned. General Syrový, who became the head of the cabinet, announced mobilization. Outwardly, these measures seem quite worthy, but ... the inner essence of the action can be completely different. So the word "mobilization" can mean that 2 million Czechs (this is the size of their mobilized army) will receive rifles and will wait in their uniquely fortified passes for 2.2 million Germans (and this is the full strength of the German army). Or maybe "mobilization" also means a simple verbal argument to try to bargain for something else in the London lobby of the Foreign Office.

Reference:

By the autumn of 1938, Germany had brought the size of the army to 2 million 200 thousand people, with 720 tanks and 2500 aircraft. The mobilized armed forces of Czechoslovakia numbered 2 million soldiers and officers, with 469 tanks and 1582 aircraft. This army was based on powerful defensive structures and could well offer more than worthy resistance, but gave the country away without a fight.

III AMAZING QUESTIONS And how, in fact, everything was in this Munich?

Just a couple of lines can be added to the history of the last "Munich days" itself:

Once an Englishman, a Frenchman, a German and an Italian gathered in Munich (quite an anecdotal beginning), and the German immediately announced that his troops would enter the Sudetenland, regardless of the negotiations: | October (every other day). And on the night of the 30th, the Englishman, Frenchman, German and Italians signed an agreement that, indeed, "let him enter." And the Czech representatives were really waiting in the parish

World War II. Reboot 151

zhey. And yet another German and an Englishman, in the same place, in Munich, since they had already arrived, signed a separate agreement, which some corrosive historians call "the actual German-British non-aggression pact..."

It is also known that three days before, on September 26, a German received a letter from an American (President Roosevelt) with one very interesting phrase, which, in general, was sent to Munich.

had nothing to do with it, but was nevertheless a very important phrase, which we will consider in the chapter "The Law of the Great War".

Of course, this anecdotal version of the "Munich Summit" cannot be limited. Here are the memoirs of an eyewitness, Hitler's translator, Schmidt. (Although it is possible that in this chronicle you will feel something anecdotal.)

"... in Munich there was also a small skirmish with Chamberlain. He insistently raised one issue, which, on the whole, did not matter much. It concerned the transfer to Germany of Czechoslovak public property in the ceded territory. Chamberlain persistently sought an answer to the question of who would compensate the Czechoslovak government for the cost of buildings and structures that would pass to Germany along with the territory of the Sudetenland. It was obvious that in this case it was not the prime minister and politician who was speaking, but the former finance minister and business man. Hitler became more and more restless. Finally, Hitler exploded. "Our time is too precious to be wasted on such trivialities!" he called to Chamberlain. This happened when Chamberlain, to crown it all, also raised the question of whether the cattle would remain in the Sudeten territory, or whether a certain number of livestock should not be taken to the territory that would remain from Czechoslovakia ...

The draft agreement proposed by Mussolini was meanwhile translated into the three languages of the conference, and on its basis, with a few minor changes, the famous Munich Agreement was worked out.

Igor Shumeiko

The decision, which was finally signed between 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning on September 30 ...

Around nine o'clock in the evening, Hitler invited everyone to dine with him in the banquet hall. Chamberlain and Daladier apologized, saying they had to call their governments; they were obviously not in the mood to attend a banquet. They secured peace, but at the cost of a serious loss of prestige. Under pressure from Hitler, they came to an agreement that an ally of France should cede part of its territory to Germany. As we now know, both France and England had to put considerable pressure on Czechoslovakia, so it was quite understandable that Chamberlain and Daladier looked very depressed that evening.

Consequently, an exclusively Italo-German company sat with Hitler at the same banquet table, which turned out to be quite long. It was then that Mussolini made his statement about the possibility of catastrophic consequences for Italy during the Abyssinian War if the League of Nations extended its sanctions on oil even for just one week.

That is, a little earlier, Ethiopia had its own "Munich".

On September 30, the Czech army began to retreat from the Sudetenland. The mountain strongholds, large industrial centers, which formed the basis of the country's defense power, were leaving. And Hitler, having annexed the Sudetenland, presented Czechoslovakia with a new list of demands. And again, staged incidents, spreading rumors about the persecution of the German ethnic minority, which now remained in the truncated territory of Czechoslovakia. On March 15, 1939, the Germans entered the rest of Czechoslovakia. Deprived of fortified defensive lines, the Czechs were unable to resist. Hitler said: "From the very beginning it was clear to me that I could not be content with German territory in the Sudetenland. It was only a partial solution...

World War II. Reboot

So much has been said and written about all the collisions of that same Franco-Czech-Soviet union treaty that if a middle-aged person now gives up everything and only studies memoirs and dissertations on this topic, he will be provided with reading for two lives ahead.

It is only important to repeat the generally recognized:

a) the French tried with all their might to avoid the fulfillment of the main thing. the final clause of the treaty: the provision of military assistance. Their requests for English mediation and Daladier's final signature in Munich are the seal of Cain in indelible ink;

6) the Czech Republic itself refused Soviet military assistance - for fear of not being able to cope without simultaneous French support.

Thank God, these facts have not yet been disputed by anyone, they are only hushed up. And for the sake of complete fairness, it must be admitted that the military assistance of the Soviet Union on the strategic scales of 1938 really meant less than the French. Even much less - but not because of the insufficient determination of the Soviet government, but only because of the remoteness, the lack of a common border with Germany and the extremely vile position of the Polish Beck government (a categorical ban on the passage of Soviet troops, up to the threat of war). In March 1939, Polysa would receive the highly developed Teshinsky district from the Czech heritage as Hitler's encouragement for this service, and literally six months later, in September of the same year, he would receive everything else due.

They are trying to devalue the Soviet resolve of 1938 with the future Molotov-Ribentrop Pact, but this is a real trick. There is such a category of tricks based on the features of optical perception ("this ball seems to you larger than this - and if you measure it ..."). From the 2006 goal, 1938 and 1939 really seem to be one day. But in fact, in 1938, the USSR was still waging a real war with Hitler on the fields of Spain. and victory is there

154 Igor Shumeiko

th remained in question. A similar war (aircraft, sending a corps through Romania) and with much greater intensity (correction for proximity) could have been waged in Czechoslovakia even under the Polish blockade.

As early as September 17, 1938, the Czech Minister of Foreign Affairs Kroft admitted: "The USSR is doing more for Czechoslovakia than can be demanded under the treaty."

The most unpleasant (and false) interpretation of this book for the author is the "anti-Czech pamphlet". Selective, bad-faith quoting may present the case in this way, so...

Proactive comment

Indeed, the main attention in the unfolding of the world war is given to the Czech Republic. Attention is focused not only on the fact that this was the largest military and economic "gift" to Hitler, but also on the fact that then, in 1938, he was closest to defeat and overthrow. The well-known "strike" (in the words of Marabini) of one part of the German army and the readiness for an uprising of another was due, among other things, to the realization of the unreality of the task ahead: an attempt to break through the fortified Sudeten Mountains. But Hitler and Chamberlain were again able, figuratively speaking, to show their tongues to the German military bores.

There can be only one objection: the British are free to give security guarantees to the Czechs, they are free to take them back. After all, as their fundamental foreign policy postulate says, "England has no permanent allies, England has permanent interests." But the fact is that in Munich they told the Czechs not this, but something completely different: "Give up the Sudetenland, and within the new borders you will receive new guarantees."

Chamberlain and Halifax were more afraid of the first bomb on Prague than the Czechs, because "they

World War II. Reboot

maybe they'll sit out, and our cabinet will definitely be resigned." Actually, this political prediction of Chamberlain was correct. When the real war started, they really were dismissed and Churchill was appointed. And not by the ability to military leadership. Just Churchill, the Minister of the Navy, himself lost big in Norway. But, perhaps, what is required of the prime minister in such an era is not military skill, but only the determination to fight. Plus "not stained". Chamberlain was responsible not only for Munich, but also for all that deceitful politically correct atmosphere, for the sake of maintaining which (just for an extra twenty weeks!) Czechoslovakia was "torn apart". After all, the Czechs were explained that, stubbornly because of the Sudetenland, they were standing against NOT ONLY Germany. but also to the entire European consensus, world public opinion... A country that embarked on this path would turn into a pariah state, speaking already in modern terms. And the eventual acceptance of help from another pariah, the Soviet Union, would only add to the Czech challenge and guilt. If the Czechs did not have any English guarantees at all, they most likely would have held out. This, of course, is the same "subjunctive mood that history does not tolerate", but still a combination of two factors – a certain military advantage (2 million in mountain fortresses is five times stronger than 2.2 million stormers), plus the readiness of the Wehrmacht to overthrow Hitler after the war. how four years ago the Wehrmacht, in alliance with Hitler, liquidated the SA - in total, they make such an outcome the most likely.

Churchill just fiercely criticized that policy, realizing the negligible price of the then European consent. He points to the most important starting point of that "European era". sliding into a new war: 1925, the Locarno Conference, for which the first Chamberlain - Austin - received the Order of the Garter and the Nobel Peace Prize. The Munich of the second Chamberlain—Neville—simply resulted from that policy, bringing it to understandable consequences.

Igor Shumeiko

Even if British policy were openly pro-German, it would be easier for the Czechs to prepare for war. Taki Przemyśl Odokar on the Moravian field - remember? — would certainly prefer that the allies who attacked him from behind were on the side of the Habsburgs at the beginning of the battle. The nation of Jan Hus and Georgy Podebrad was betrayed by the Europe of holders of the Order of the Garter and Nobel Peace Prize laureates.

Well, fellow Slavs, we too were betrayed by one Nobel Peace Prize laureate. And recently, in 2005, this famous bribe was reserved for Yushchenko. But - underestimated! Or the stimulation of the atomic El Baradei seemed more important at that political moment.

That would be a great topic for a journalistic investigation. Nobel Prizes, as you know, are paid with interest. The Board of Trustees invested the legacy of the inventor of dynamite into some large and profitable, but most importantly, sustainable business. Real estate and minerals roughly meet all three criteria. (But there was no Norwegian oil in the 1930s.) And if... it turns out that this "business" is the extraction and transportation of Scandinavian iron ore, then the whole story will simply take on classical completeness and clarity. Then the entire trajectory of the Swedish iron will become visibly visible, right down to the splinters in the bodies of war veterans, and the gold, all the way to the pockets of Chamberlain and Gorbachev.

Chapter 12 And how many columns were there?

The main theme, the main term of this book — "The Great War", "The Law of the Great War" — I intend to illustrate with all the examples available to me, to reveal by all possible methods, including the method of contradiction, giving examples of "small wars." The "Big War on" begins when the "Big Enemy" is identified, and ends with its complete destruction. But in this historical period with very blurred boundaries (especially the lower one), a lot happens, including individual private wars, which, due to the tension of forces, the mutual fury of the parties and, as a result, the level of "politeness", the level of compliance with written and unwritten rules are very different from the contemporary "Bolya War". Ironically, the leaders of these small wars can even be "proud" in front of the participants in the "Big" of their politeness,

moderation, in short, the whole set of qualities, today summed up as political correctness. But the main irony is that they are really proud of "their small" wars, they impose their own standards, rules for assessing the nature and consequences of the "Big". Let's say Denmark. Several hours of resistance. As the commander of the invading German corps, General Kaupi, reported: "From our pace, the Unih (Danes) took their breath away."

15\$ Igor Shumeiko

Humane wording. Note that these words would be completely suitable for describing, say, a football match "Germany - Denmark - 5:0". However, with any description of the hostilities, even with this one, one cannot fall into an insulting tone, indiscriminately declaring: "Everyone was sent! » You can not forget, ignore that not all. The personal guards of the royal palace of Amalienburg were not afraid to open fire. The hopelessness of their resistance only underscores their personal heroism. The capture of the entire country cost the Germans 20 dead, the Danes 36 dead. And almost all the dead are Amalienburg. (According to other sources, there are two Germans who died during the capture of Denmark. And the difference is the added dead in the subsequent period.)

The Norwegians resisted much longer, but they were helped by the landscape of the country, and the English landings, and the fleet. The Dutch are closer to the Danish version. Belgians are closer to Norwegian. Luxembourg - two wounded (probably someone slipped).

And all these blitzkriegs, including French (where the resistance was, of course, much stronger than in Belgium or Norway), and all these blitzkriegs gave rise, and immediately, in "real time", not the suspicion, not a version, not a myth. "Fifth column"!

SH AMATEUR INQUIRIES And why, in fact, the fifth? Does this have a © "fifth angle" connection?

"The Fifth Column" is, in general, one of the leitmotifs of the descriptions of the Second World War. It was the unusual nature of the invasions, the pace of offensives that gave rise to such a version: "The Fifth column is to blame."

And this term was born during the war in Spain of 1936-1939, when the fascist Francoists launched an offensive against Madrid in four columns, suspicions flashed in the world press

what is being prepared and

World War II. Reboot

a violent performance by Franco's supporters in Madrid itself - and this will be the most dangerous, "fifth" column. The fears were justified, albeit in part. But that was a civil war. No, let's clarify, it was already the Soviet-German-Italian war plus the civil war of the Spaniards. (This is for admirers of historical "fantasies" about Stalin instructing Hitler.) In civil wars, indeed, betrayals, stabs in the back, "fifth columns" are not uncommon.

But after Spain, of all the partial wars of the Second World War, only the Yugoslav war was clearly civil in nature, and the ghost of the "fifth column" "wandered around Europe", just like another well-known "ghost".

They pointed to two objects, to two sources of threat. First, there were significant German communities in several countries. Secondly, there was (more precisely, it was suspected that it existed as a kind of similarity to the Comintern, Sopintern) a fascist international.

And there were also two reasons for maintaining the "fifth-column" idea in the public mind, two reasons for the high convertibility of this version. The first I called: the need to explain quick defeats. Second: maintaining a "high vigilance" among those who decided to avoid defeat.

I'll save my political "interest" for later. and first I will give the opinion of an independent researcher on this topic. Historian Louis Le Jong, author of the book *The Fifth Column in Western Europe*, has collected significant material, and his conclusion is that the Fifth Column had almost no influence on the course of hostilities in Western Europe. His dossier contains hundreds of facts like this: all the newspapers repeated that the German ships entered the Oslo Fjord only because. that "someone's vile hand" cut off the electric cable that undermined the minefields. So, there were no Graduations there.

Igor Shumeiko

Belgium did indeed have its own fascists, Leon Degrel's "Rexist", but it turns out that they almost ignored Hitler, and some little money (Louis de Jong will also bring in figures - about 20-30 thousand dollars!) and instructions were accepted only from Mussolini, but Italy at the time of the passage of Belgium was not yet at war.

German communities (with one exception) were also not involved in practical military tasks. The main thing that bothered Hitler was that foreign Germans should become completely Nazis, the conductors of his policy in these regions after the conquest.

Well, as for this single exception, I again "take the floor". Of course, these are my "favorite" Sudeten Germans. "Giant Germans", according to the old name I found for the Sudeten Mountains. This community really played a significant role in the conquest of Czechoslovakia.

Hitler created an obedient political leadership in the Sudetenland, whose leader, Konrad Henlein, defined his salary as follows:

"We must always demand so much that our demands cannot be met."

We remember that when, during the May crisis of 1938, the President of Czechoslovakia, Benes, announced a partial mobilization and arrested several German hooligans, Henlein fled to Germany. By the way, towards the end of this epic, Hitler was already planning to replace the insufficiently aggressive Henlein with another "Giant German" - Frank. So the Anglo-French betrayal in Munich saved not only Hitler, but also (at the micro level) the career of a certain "Giant German Henlein", already forgotten today. And in general, the only successful Hitlerite "fifth column" was the Sudetenland. And that was only because she had such "column-drivers": Chamberlain, Halifax, Daladier.

But in general, the "fifth column", as it was born on the pages of newspapers in 1937, basically marched there.

World War II. Reboot

So what else, what other "political interest" draws my attention to this topic?!

Yes, all the same! I have such a suspicion, or, let's say, a feeling that the "fifth column" is also a kind of justification, an argument in post-war disputes like "certificates about the country's participation in the resistance movement". An attempt to rationalize the "Great War", adapt it, model it as a sum of easily explainable blocks.

I explain. We can say, for example, to the Danes:

{1}. There was a "Big War", but you were excluded from its participants within a few hours. From the participants in the struggle against Hitler, for whom you then worked for four and a half years. They will then try to answer:

(2) No! It was an ordinary, correct war + "fifth column" + "Resistance"!

Bringing with the help of these two constants everything to the equation of "Conventional war", they remain Correctly fought. And who fought wrong? UK and USSR. Great Britain, as already mentioned, without declaring war, captured Iceland in 1940, then part of Denmark. Just so that Germany does not get along with the rest of Denmark. This was justified: if Iceland were German, not a single Anglo-American convoy would have reached Murmansk.

BUT! The rules of "correct war" have been violated!

And the USSR also cleaned up part of Poland and the Baltic states. And inevitably, sooner or later, but the account "from the right to the wrong" will be presented.

So far, only Lithuania is trying to make formal legal, financial claims against Russia. The rest of the Balts, the Czech Republic, Poland, Finland, United (again) Europe, represented by the Council of Europe and PACE, are next in line.

Of course, all of the above countries and organizations are a kind of convention. It means individual

and Igor Shumeiko

parties. factions, personalities within them. As, for example, not the whole of Finland, but a separate specially created society, demands the seizure of Karelia from the "Russian aggressor". And the "Lithuanian accounts", the power in the twice donated Vilnius (in 1940 and in 1945) in the Axis, are issued by the party of Landsbergis. And in Estonia, not all public organizations in the country were involved in the transfer of border posts, but only Kaistelit. (This was in the period of 1992-1994, when our border with Estonia was not yet guarded, the "Kaistelites" carried it 20-40 kilometers (?) to the west, moving new border posts And "capturing", for example, Ivangorod.)

"Katyn". "Prague Tanks-68" is also not the object of work of the entire "public" of the respective countries...

But what term, what general name can be given to all these groups, parties, factions? Not a superficial nickname, not an offensive nickname, namely, an objective definition. Thinking about this led me to one very. at first glance, a strange conclusion. If we sum up their programs and slogans, they will be, strictly speaking, the Revanchists. Their main claims are to the results of the Second World War, to the "Yalta system", be it new borders or the division of Europe into "spheres of influence" (both 1956 and 1968 were nothing more than a defense of those spheres). And an attempt to win back the results of a lost war is revenge. And without any further political coloring, the supporters of such a policy are Revanchists. But do you feel how the language itself seems to demand to add: "German revanists"?

The "German revanchists" of the ever-memorable Adolf von Thadden, "impudently demanding a revision of the results of the Second World War." Our superficial agitprop, of course, especially pressed on the name, calling it: "Adolf the Second." Fact. that the sister of Adolf von Thadden was one of the heroines of the German Resistance who was executed in 1944,

World War II. Reboot

was not advertised, even if it was accidentally known to the editors of Pravda and Krokodil.

And all the decades of repetition of that stamp prevent the construction of a seemingly simple logical chain:

The "revanchists" in contemporary Europe are not only Germans. Because not only the Germans were defeated.

Those who spent real and huge. and a very difficult job of embedding in the United (by Hitler) Europe, will always be in a claim to the main culprit of the ruin of their

COMPANY. Their "affiliation" with fascism is manifested not only in their work at that time, but also in today's anti-Russian policy.

But there is also a lady who lost in that war, this is the very idea of political correctness.

The Chamberlains were undoubtedly and irreproachably politically correct: both the Nobel Peace Prize winner Austin and the second, Neville, who brought impeccably executed and correctly signed treaties by everyone (except the then "rogue state"), containing, as they announced: "Peace for our generation."

And most importantly, the fact that the Victory of 1945 was obtained by anti-politically correct means - all this, with objective inevitability, puts this venerable lady (Political Correctness) in the ranks of revenge-seekers.

Isn't the author exaggerating when describing the threat of the whole "Front of Revanchists" and introducing completely heterogeneous, hardly commensurable political forces into it? PACE, the Lithuanian Seim, "Kaistelite" and some kind of "Idea" of some kind of Political Correctness - why frighten with it?

One talented political scientist noted the following feature of modern Western society. (Not a flaw, just a feature.)

The masses want to be a constant object of sounding. And the elites have no idea how to carry out their managerial functions without these "probes".

Igor Shumeiko

And what seems important to me to add: these "probes" are not only and not so much formal elections, referendums. Just the popularity of such events is declining — see the statistics of voter turnout. Modern "probing" is a constant stuffing, testing ideas in a playful, semi-playful form. Political, historical ideas "together" with films, hits, collections of leading couturiers - this is still perceived ...

Closer "to our" topic, the most important social and historical facts of the War were the films "Saving Private Ryan", "Schindler's List", etc. Accordingly, among all the variations of the idea under discussion, the one with the brightest and most popular "video sequence" is chosen, that which is better on TV. The replica of the hero of the film. Or even a "historical assessment" from the lips of the actor who played this character. Or even someone else from the film crew. So, the main authority "on the Holocaust" was, of course, Steven Spielberg.

So my advice to Rezun to replenish the Trotsky-39 quotation baggage with the testimonies of Frida Kahlo - Salma Hayek - is not so absurd.

Political correctness, equalizing everyone with everyone in the entire world history, is today one of the most "strongly thrown" ideas. US Senators have apologized for the slave trade, the Pope has apologized for the Crusades. The Germans are for the Holocaust. Then the dish is started up in a circle. The Turks need to apologize for 1915, but we, of course, need more: for 1940, and for 1956, and for 1968...

And what do we care about this worldwide fashion for "historical pardons"?

For those fellow citizens who have read the book up to this page and who "don't care about war, history" (although it's hard to combine: indifference to history and reading this book up to ... a page), but nevertheless - for them I have an argument. Indeed, the above

World War II. Reboot

to such a motley historical selection that it is not clear: where (and why?) can it be extrapolated?

Well, according to this logic, the Pope of Rome, after apologizing for the Crusades, simply had to apologize for winning the battle of Poitiers. (Three hundred years before the Crusades, there were mm... "crescent campaigns": the Arabs conquered then Christian North Africa, Spain, passed half of France, but were defeated at Poitiers.) For this, the pope, perhaps, simply couldn't apologize?

One can also imagine (Chesterton or Beckett would appreciate such a theater of the absurd): the current president of tiny Macedonia at the UN Assembly apologizes to half the world for the campaigns of Alexander the Great.

And, in general, this whole list of repentances is so cunningly compiled that it seems to be easy and even fashionable, "cool" to enter into it. Our apologies for Katyn are precisely from the category of such "historical jokes": everyone is gallantly apologizing—come on, too. But only here in this list, where actual crimes and God knows what else are mixed in, one must pay attention to the dates. The Germans apply huge reparations to the Bundeschancellor's apologies for the Second World War - but this is a proven and more awkward crime. The year 1915 also threatens the Turks with the most serious sanctions.

For example, tomorrow Tunisia will send its apologies to Italy "for the genocide of the Romans at Cannae ... and for the entire campaign of Hannibal" (today's Tunisians, Bedouins, will even be flattered to be involved in world history, "Carthage" is already being promoted as a Tunisian tourist brand). And then all of a sudden ... and in Russia a politician will turn up who will apologize from the TV screen, and especially on New Year's Eve - well, how to send two bytes.

Now, those fellow citizens. which "history is on the drum": with these apologies you can get very real money, they are called "reparations".

This attraction of repentance also looks like a wedding tradition in very bad taste. Letting go in a circle

Igor Shumeiko

a tray for offerings to the young. And some kind of merchant, after three minutes waving over his head a bundle of yellow bills, finally throws it on the tray. And immediately look at you: well, how much will you give up ?!

So, dear Russian, before you climb for your pack, take a closer look (although it will seem impolite): what, in fact, did the one who shook his pack for a long time throw away? Maybe these are fake or some kind of "Kerenki" that have long been out of circulation?

So. having heard about the parlors for the Crusades, — compatriot! - do not rush to throw your "sorry", suppose. for Katyn. The one who launched the boat is just counting on speed, turmoil, publicity and "inconvenience to double-check." Namely, Katyn, as the historian Mukhin writes, requires the most careful study. Including respect for the memory of the Poles who died there, it requires clarification of the true circumstances of the tragedy, and not chatter and momentary political need of the future pizza advertiser. Just as carefully it is necessary to study the circumstances of the death of 200,000 captured Red Army soldiers in Poland in 1920-1930.

Slow thoroughness, non-politicization. should become the main quality of the "investigators" of those historical cases.

But, of course, for the majority, for normal citizens, apologies are unacceptable not because of some kind of "reparation dough", but because of the presence of a national, historical dignity.

It is impossible to consider the current Lithuanian financial account for 1940, not because it may be overestimated (and even overestimated for sure: you need to know the "memel heroes"). You can't even consider it because it means getting on a par with real military

criminals, and because this is a direct insult to all our compatriots who gained victory in that war...

World War II. Reboot

I am not going to dispute the "Turkish year 1915", other incidents or crimes. The situation is more or less clear to me only with claims to Russia. And as for that Great War, the first of the "heads of repentance" must certainly be 1938. Munich, which saved Hitler from collapse, strengthened his power and the potential of Germany.

Further: United Europe-P (Brussels) must recognize one more simple historical fact - its continuity with United Europe-1 (Berlin), with the exception, of course, of Great Britain and Russia. And all the talk that the Yi Unification is based on values that are so different from the Unification-... Like the fact that "Countries, nations, and specific, still physically living people, we, excuse me, are the same, but the ideal ally - it's just heaven and earth! - all this talk is just a smokescreen.

How does any litigation or historical dispute begin? The identification of the parties. Who blames? Who testifies? Who offers? And all repentant-historical discussions should begin only with the following questions: Have the united European ideas of the Berlin version themselves improved, humanized and grown to the Brussels version? Or were they redeemed by blood in the literal biblical sense? If yes, then whose?

Chapter 13

Was it easy for neutrals? (Case of Norway)

Whoever agrees with everyone, no one agrees with that. W. Churchill

Hitler's invasion of Norway, Churchill, who was then the first lord of the Admiralty, commented in the House of Commons as follows:

"From my point of view, which is shared by my experienced advisers, Herr Hitler made a huge strategic mistake ... and we greatly benefited from what happened in Scandinavia ... He committed a number of formations on the Norwegian coast, for which he will now have to fight, if need be, throughout the summer, against powers far superior in navies, and capable of transporting those forces to the field of operation with greater ease than he. I don't see any counter-advantage that he received... I believe we benefited greatly from... this blunder of strategy, which was provoked by our mortal enemy."

On the one hand, everyone is well aware that the British, by this "huge strategic mistake of Hitler

World War II. Reboot

they could not take advantage of it (and the historian, with a bias towards positivist philosophy, will add: "So there was no mistake"}, they acted extremely slowly, indecisively, mediocrely, as a result of which the tactical success of the Germans grew into a major strategic achievement. They have established themselves in Norway.

But on the other hand, Churchill was not so far from the truth when he called Norway a trap for Hitler and spoke of the German invasion as a step to which Hitler "was provoked."

One of the astonishing post-war discoveries was precisely that, as it turned out, the total aggressor Hitler would have preferred to leave Norway neutral and did not plan to invade it. And only clear signs of impending actions of the allies provoked him to

this step.

After historians have gained access to the captured German documents, one can try to present here something like a parallel "schedule" of the development of Hitler's and the British's plans for Norway.

September 19, 1939: at the insistence of Churchill, the British Cabinet accepted the project of creating a minefield in Norwegian territorial waters and "blocking the transport of Swedish iron ore from Narvik" to Germany. (Similar projects were also raised during the First World War.) The question of laying minefields off the coast of Norway became a topic of discussion even in the press. And this caused concern and countermeasures on the part of the Germans.

Early October 1939: The first mention of Norway at all: the Commander-in-Chief of the Naval Forces, Admiral Raeder, expressed misgivings. that the Norwegians could open their ports to the British and reported to Hitler on the possible strategic consequences if the British occupied these ports. Raeder noted that for action

170 Igor Shumeiko

it would be beneficial for German submarines to get bases on the coast of Norway, for example in Trondheim. However, Hitler rejected this proposal. His thoughts were occupied with plans for an offensive in the West, and he did not want to hear about any operations that could divert forces and resources from the Western Front.

November 1939: Soviet-Finnish war. Churchill saw this as a new opportunity to strike at the enemy's flank under the pretext of helping Finland: "I welcomed this development and saw in it the possibility of achieving a major strategic advantage - depriving Germany of access to vital iron ore reserves."

16 December 1939: Churchill's plan to send an expeditionary force to Finland. "Such actions may force the Germans to occupy Scandinavia, since 'if you shoot at the enemy, he will shoot back' ... we gain more than we lose from the German strike against Norway and Sweden."

November 1939: In Berlin, the former Minister of Defense Quisling, leader of the National Rally (No. 5 - Mazopa | Zap ip?), met with Admiral Raeder and inspired him with fears that England would soon occupy Norway. Quisling asked for money and help to carry out a coup to overthrow the Norwegian government. He assured that he would be supported by several senior Norwegian officers, among them the head of the garrison in Narvik, Colonel Sundlo. Quisling promised to give Narvik to the Germans, who would thus outstrip the British.

Raeder persuaded Hitler to talk to Quisling in person. The meetings took place on 16 and 18 November. According to the recording of these conversations, Hitler said that he "would prefer to see Norway, like the other Scandinavian countries, neutral", BECAUSE "does not want to expand the theater of war", but, "if

World War II. Reload em |

the enemy is preparing to expand the frontiers of the war, he will take steps to protect himself from this danger."

SH AMATEUR INQUIRIES And why, in fact?

Was Quisling a "quisling"?

Question. perhaps the most "amateurish" in this rubric. But the collective image of the "quisling" (traitor, executioner, sadist, Hitler's henchman, imitator and "little Himmler" for his country) Vidkund Quisling (Oi1511?) does not really fit. The son of a priest. In 1918 he was a military attaché at the Norwegian embassy in Petrograd, and in 1920-1921 he was an attaché in Helsinki. In 1922-1923, he was a member of the international commission for rendering

to help the starving in the Volga region, the closest colleague of F. Nansen. That is, as I understand it, he gave up his military and diplomatic career for the sake of charitable work next to one of the most prominent humanists of the 20th century. In general, not the brightest representative of the "quislings". BUT... He returned to Norway as a staunch anti-communist. (I've seen enough.) In 1930 he published the book "Russia and Us" directed against the communist regime. In 1931-1933, he was Minister of War, welcomed the coming of the NSDAP to power in Germany. In May 1933, he created the Fascist Party (NS). In the elections of 1933, the NS received 27,850 votes, and in the elections of 1936 - 26,577. (A small result). And then... After the entry of the German troops on 04/09/1940 - "Hitler's henchman" (in various roles: first self-proclaimed prime minister. After the dissolution of the government by the German authorities - commissioner of the Administrative Council of Norway for the demobilization of the army. 2/2/1942 again occupation appointed Prime Minister by the authorities) ... on May 9, 1945, surrendering to the police. Prepare-

| Igor Shumeiko

raven... Shot. Of all the representatives of Hitler in the "United Europe", for some reason, it was his name that became a household name: "quisling" = see above.

January 13, 1940. An entry in the war diary of the headquarters of the German navy: "The most favorable solution would be to maintain the neutrality of Norway." At the same time, there is already concern at headquarters that "England intends to occupy Norway with the tacit consent of the Norwegian government."

On January 27, Hitler ordered his military advisers to develop, in case of need, a detailed plan for the invasion of Norway. The headquarters specially formed for this purpose held its first meeting on 5 February.

February 16: Fatal incident. The German ship "Altmark", pursued by British destroyers, on which English prisoners were transported from the South Atlantic, took refuge in the Norwegian fjord. Churchill ordered the commander of the destroyer Kossak, Captain 1-rank Vayan, to enter Norwegian waters and rescue the British prisoners who were on board the Altmark. The English destroyer was driven off by two Norwegian gunboats, and the subsequent protest of the Norwegian government against the invasion of Norwegian waters was rejected.

But Hitler regarded this protest as a gesture intended to deceive him, and was inclined to believe that the Norwegian government was collaborating with England. But in the opinion of the German admirals, the incident with the Altmark played a decisive role in the fact that Hitler agreed to start an intervention in Norway.

(Here it is, the tragedy of the "neutral"! Norway was desperately balancing between the threats of the English and German invasion. And their very easy rebuff to the British brought the German threat closer.)

February 20, 1940: Hitler instructed General von Falkenhorst to train the Expeditionary Force.

for landing in

World War II. Reboot r 5

Norway, saying at the same time: "I was informed about the intention of the British to land in this area, and I want to be there before them. The occupation of Norway by the British would be a strategic success, as a result of which the British would gain access to the Baltic, where we have neither troops nor coastal fortifications.

On March 4, Hitler issued a directive to complete preparations for the invasion. In addition to Norway, it was also planned to occupy Denmark, which was considered as a necessary strategic springboard and stronghold for ensuring German communications. But still, the final decision on the invasion of Hitler has not yet been made. As the transcripts of the meetings between Hitler and Raeder show, the Fuhrer, on the one hand, continued to believe that "preservation

Norway's neutrality is the best option" for Germany, and on the other hand, he was afraid of the British landing in Norway.

March 9: Assessing the plans of action of the naval forces, Hitler spoke of the dangers of the forthcoming operation, contrary to all principles of warfare at sea, and at the same time asserted that it was "urgently needed."

13 March: German concern increased. There was a report that British submarines were concentrating off the southern coast of Norway.

March 14: A radio message was intercepted instructing Allied transports to be on ready to sail.

15 March: Several French officers arrive in Bergen. The Germans felt they were being overtaken, because their own expeditionary force was not yet ready.

March 20: This was the day of the scheduled English landing at Narvik. The landing force was to quickly move through the territory of Norway to the iron ore deposits in Gyllivar. However, the military defeat of Finland and

174 Igor Shumeiko

her surrender on 13 March frustrated those plans. The Allies lost the pretext for entering Norway.

April 8: This was the newly appointed date for the British operation in Norway. But this new delay fatally reduced the chances of the Allies to succeed in the operation, as it made it possible for the Germans to invade Norway ahead of the Allies.

On April 1, Hitler was informed that the Norwegian anti-aircraft and coastal batteries had been given permission to open fire without waiting for orders from the high command. This 03 is the beginning that the Norwegians were preparing for action, and if Hitler had delayed, he would have lost the chances of achieving surprise and success. The final date for the invasion ... April 9th.

On April 9, British newspapers reported that the day before ships of the naval forces of England and France entered the Norwegian ocean and set minefields there to block the way to these waters for the ships of the countries trading with Germany. Enthusiastic responses to these measures alternated in the press with arguments justifying the violation of Norway's neutrality. However, the newspapers were lagging behind the events, because that same morning the radio broadcast a much more startling report: German troops were landing at several points on the coast of Norway and had already entered Denmark.

Next, we will quote the English historian Liddell Garth (PaChe | NATO, whose work "The Second World War" became ... we repeat the assessment of experts: "almost the main official history of the British armed forces."

"The audacity of Germany, which did not take into account the superiority of England at sea, shocked the allied leaders. Speaking in the House of Commons that day, Prime Minister Chamberlain announced that the Germans had landed on the western coast of Norway at Bergen and Trondheim, as well as on the south coast. Chamberlain went on to say: "Received

World War II. Reboot 175

there are several reports of a similar landing at Narvik, but I highly doubt their plausibility." It seemed unbelievable to the British leaders that Hitler would dare to land so far north, especially since their own naval forces were in full force in this area, covering the laying of mines and other activities. It has been suggested that Narvik was confused with Larvik, a town on

south coast of Norway. However, by the end of the day it became known that the Germans had occupied Oslo, the capital of Norway, and the main ports, including Narvik. All landing operations were carried out simultaneously and were crowned with success.

... it will be a curious discovery how small the forces captured Stolin and the main ports of Norway. They included 2 battlecruisers, a "pocket" battleship, 7 cruisers, 14 destroyers, 28 submarines, a number of auxiliary vessels, and about 10,000 personnel from the front lines of the three divisions used for the invasion. In no place did the number of the first echelon of the landing force exceed 2,000 people. A single airborne battalion participated in the capture of airfields in Oslo and Stavanger. This was the first time parachute troops were used in the war, and they proved to be a very effective means. However, the decisive role in the success of the Germans was played by the air force... (800 combat and 250 transport aircraft). The air force literally stunned the Norwegian population and then paralyzed the Allied countermeasures.

On April 7, at 13.25, British aviation discovered large forces of the German fleet, rapidly moving northward through the Skagerrak Strait to the coast of Norway. Churchill writes: "It was hard for them to believe that these forces were heading for Narvik, despite the message from Copenhagen that Hitler intended to seize this port."

Moreover, as Churchill notes, the Norwegian government at that time was "concerned chiefly

about Igor Shumeiko

the actions of the British. The mine-laying operations of the British diverted the attention of the Norwegians precisely in those crucial 24 hours when the Germans landed.

The greatest surprise of all the German successes in the early days was the capture of Narvik, for this northern port was about 1,200 miles from the German naval bases. Two Norwegian coastal defense ships bravely met the German destroyers, but were quickly sunk. Coastal defense forces did not even attempt to resist... The next day, a flotilla of English destroyers entered the fjord and entered into battle. Both sides suffered equal losses. On April 13, a new detachment of English destroyers arrived, led by the battleship Warspite. The German ships were finished. however, by this time German troops were already entrenched in and around Narvik. .

At Bergen, the Germans suffered some losses from Norwegian warships and batteries, but, having landed on the shore, they did not meet any resistance.

However, on the approaches to Oslo, the main invasion forces received a tangible blow: the cruiser Blucher, on board of which there were many military personnel, was sunk by torpedoes from the Oscarborg fortress, and the Germans had to abandon their attempt to enter the bay until then. until the fortress surrendered after powerful air raids. The Norwegians can also write down the cruisers "Karlerue" and "Koenigsberg" on the combat account - they, wrecked, lost their mobility, have already been finished off by British submarines and aviation.

Thus, the task of capturing the Norwegian capital was entrusted to the parachute troops... (and was carried out)... by five companies of paratroopers landed at the capital's airfield, Forneby. Leaving the planes, the paratroopers lined up in a column and moved to Oslo with the orchestra in front ... At noon, this airborne assault parade entered the city. However, the delay caused by the preparations for this parade. allowed the king and government to flee north.

World War II. Reboot |7

The batteries of the Kristiansand fortress drove the German ships away from the shore, and then bombers were thrown at the fortress, which silenced the batteries..."

Here I will interrupt Garth Liddell. Both in his further descriptions and in Caius Becker's "Military Diaries of the Luftwaffe", what caught my eye most of all was this sort of "spectacular unevenness of resistance". And I think you will agree with me.

Becker "... three of the six Me-110s flew on the same engine. Yiu all had the last drops of fuel. We must sit down immediately! And if no one is able to capture Oslo-Forneby, then the fighter crews will do it themselves! ... even Lent appeared on foot, leaving his "Messerschmit" with a cut-off landing gear near a house on the border of the airfield. He and his Cuban radio operator! miraculously escaped injury, the latter even removed a machine gun with a disk and came to the aid of his squadron comrades - a handful of people who had captured a guarded airfield!

VU9.17 the Junkers link went to land. The braking distance of heavy vehicles led them to the very rocks, in which air defense posts were equipped ... The soldiers got out of the planes and began to warm up after a tiring flight in a constrained state. Making sure that everything around is calm, but lit a cigarette. Hansen's hair stood on end. Rushing to the soldiers, he showed where the Norwegian anti-aircraft guns and machine-gun nests were. Gut, they finally took cover and sent forward reconnaissance groups, which soon returned with prisoners. The Norwegians pleaded defeated... the prisoners were ordered to clear the runway from the smoking wreckage of aircraft... the messenger proudly handed over the telegram: "Forneby is in our hands. | squadron 2C 76"... At the headquarters of the corps in Hamburg, these 8 "Messerschmitgs" were already ^{sa in} considered decommissioned...> ETC.

Complete "unevenness of resistance" according to the branches of the armed forces, you must agree. Norwegian sailors (and coastal forces) sink German cruisers, and the air force base

175 Igor Shumeiko

surrendered to fighter crews. And then the whole capital "accepts parallel" of five landing companies. It's like... I don't know if the Norwegians will be offended, more like the expeditions of the conquistador Cortes. The natives also fought tolerably with edged weapons, but the thunder of muskets and the sight of a cavalryman inspired mystical horror in them, and they surrendered, even having a numerical superiority of 10: 1, 20: 1.

Uneven distribution of the state-political impulse to different branches of the military, or these impulses themselves, orders-instructions, are deliberately different... Again, I recall Soviet and American cosmonauts (military) shaking hands while their fellow submariners ram each other. (In the chapter on Hugo Grotius and the Law of War and Peace...)

Newspaper commentators noted, albeit with great restraint, the difference in the behavior of the brother kings: Christian H. the Danish king. who capitulated to the Germans (he even congratulated the German general Chimer on a "brilliant job done") and the Norwegian king Haakon UP. Refusing to capitulate, he fled with the government to the city of Elverum, on the Swedish border, and called on the people to resist the invaders...

And now about the "Main occupier" "commander in Norway

One general, one country

Not being a collector of biographies of various characters of the Third Reich, however, for a very long time, and rather by chance, I remembered that some German general had drawn up a plan to capture Norway using a tourist map. That information flashed in an era when we did not publish serious literature with information, especially biographical information, about "the other side". Early 70s. The memoirs of Marshal Zhukov have just been published, and at the cost of hitting

World War II. Reboot

on their pages of the great commander Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, and from the persons, the names of the Third Reich, only the inmates of the Nuremberg dock were known + those who had fled from the retribution of the peoples according to the method of their demon-possessed Fuhrer + some more covered up by the Americans for the needs of the future "revenge" ... and that's it, then the gray mass.

And already today I read: yes, indeed, General Falkenhorst developed a plan of operation to capture Denmark and Norway on a tourist map: this fact seemed significant even to the compiler of the strict Enyklopedia [And the Reich].

The Norwegian operation is indeed one of the most daring and successful in the entire Second World War. It is also unique how small forces were carried out the capture of the country, and the fact that the amphibious landing was carried out, despite the overwhelming advantage of the allied fleet. What does this "tourist card" mean?

Despite the fact that in the German (as, indeed, in any other) General Staff there is a "complete dossier" on any country (especially on one that was a likely theater of operations even in the First World War), including not only the most detailed maps, but also thousands of pages of other necessary information about roads, bridges, mooring walls, etc... That is, for some not very clear sign, the choice of the Fuhrer in February 1940 fell on General Falkenhorst as an alternative to the entire German General Staff. In general, it is known that Hitler carried out such combinations several more times. (Manstein was able to present to the Führer his revolutionary new idea of defeating France only with the patronage of Rundstedt, and bypassing the entire General Staff, and having received ardent approval to begin detailed development.) But since Falkenhorst's "impromptu" is one of the most scanty biographical and official data to find some prerequisites ...

Igor Shumeiko

More or less unique in the life of "our hero" BEFORE 1940, it may seem that he changed his surname for some reason. Among the top generals of Germany, this is either a rarity, or even the only case. Nikolaus von Falkenhorst's real one was... (honestly!) von Yastrzhembsky. True, the biographical site writes it as "Jastszembski", but the "Encyclopedia" is a priority here. How to interpret this uniqueness, my knowledge is not enough. Of course, there could be no talk of any inconvenience of wearing surnames with a Slavic ending, especially discrimination. Among the Prussian-German aristocracy and the army (and this is almost the same thing), more than a third of the surnames were either "ich", OR "ski" ... But, one way or another, the replacement with the preservation of the noble "von" and the common "hishnoptichya" orientation (Fal kenhorst - falcon's nest) insulated.

So, Nikolaus von was born in 1886 in Breslau (Breslavl), Silesia.

During the First World War, he was an officer of Genzitab, later he oversaw operations in the Baltic states of the well-known General von der Goltz, and then he himself joined his Volunteer Corps. In the thirties - the military attache in Prague, Belgrade, Bucharest. That is, both by birth and at the place of service, he was connected with Eastern Europe. However, the same "Encyclopedia" notes: he took "insignificant part" in the Polish campaign.

In 1940, he was called to Berlin, and then this one of the most successful impromptu in military history took place. For some reason (a brief stay in Finland in 1918?) Hitler suddenly suggests to one of his many hundreds of generals that he sketch out a plan for the Norwegian operation. In complete secrecy from Commander-in-Chief Brauchitsch and Chief of the General Staff Halder. It was then that the historic purchase of the tourist card followed. The report probably made an impression, and on February 21, von Falkenhorst was appointed head of

World War II. Reboot 18! |

development of the Weserübung plan to capture Norway. | March von Falkenhorst was appointed commander of a separate army XX! groups with subordination only personally to Hitler.

April 9 - the beginning of the operation. On the 10th, almost all goals were achieved. Further, as is known, the landing of the British and their growing resistance caused Hitler to panic ... but von Falkenhorst continued the operation and on May 3 forced the Allies to flee Namos.

On April 30, von Falkenhorst received the title of Knight of the Iron Cross.

The British still held out near Narvik, but by June 8, von Falkenhorst forced them to completely leave Norway.

Von Falkenhorst was a supporter of the humane treatment of prisoners and civilians. Hitler, in the moment of panic mentioned above, ordered Falkenhorst to take 20 hostages, including the Bishop of Bergen, in case the Norwegian resistance continued. Falkenhorst did not comply with this order.

And all his further service is one long conflict with the sent imperial governor of Norway - the cruel executioner Josef Treboven, the former Gauleiter of Essen. Falkenhorst earned the respect of the Norwegians and his modesty. Reichskommissar Terboven lived in the royal palace, von Falkenhorst lived in two rooms in the building of the Norwegian Automobile Club.

July 25 - Von Falkenhorst is appointed commander of the Wehrmacht in Norway.

In 1941, his troops were instructed to advance on Murmansk - the Silver Fox plan. But the Soviet troops are fighting very hard. von Falkenhorst suffers heavy losses. There, each hill cost him more than the whole of Norway. 5,500 soldiers he puts down for advancing 10 kilometers and ultimately fails and stops.

182 Igor Shumeiko

In 1943, he was entrusted with the development of a plan for the invasion of Sweden.

His further actions included the fight against the Sanglian sabotage groups. In November 1942, according to the then existing rules, he handed over the captured English commandos to the SD (security service). The prisoners were shot.

Von Falkenhorst protested to Keitel and henceforth forbade all his troops to transfer prisoners to the SD.

The protests and intrigues of the governor Treboven led to the fact that von Falkenhorst lost his command. His group in 1944 was placed under the command of General RendDULICHCHCHU. And about General Falkenhorst in Berlin, there is an opinion not only of a soft-bodied liberal, but also of a loser. However, this loss of reputation and the sending of Treboven are also associated with the intrigues of Hermann Goering, an old enemy of Falkenhorst. So the general remained the conqueror of one country...

On January 20, 1945 he was awarded the German Silver Cross.

He was arrested on August 2, 1946 and sentenced to death by a British tribunal (for those executed commandos. There were versions that the British resentment towards the creator of one of their most offensive defeats also played a role). But on December 3, the death penalty was commuted to 20 years in prison. On June 23, 1953, von Falkenhorst was released. He died at the age of 83. |

Chapter 14

About measuring "Resistance"

Electrical resistance, as we know, was taught to measure by the German Georg Ohm, the author of the law of the same name. But how and how to measure the resistance to the Germans in World War II? If, in comparison with the state potential in the service of Hitler, the value of, say, the Czech resistance movement is incomparable, then with what can this value be compared, correctly compared?

Of course, with the significance, scope of resistance movements in other countries! For example, with the successes of the Resistance in France, Belarus, or... Germany.

Yes Yes. If the resistance movements in each country that was part of Hitler's CJS "Europe" are considered today not just as a politically correct "Information on the presence of Resistance", issued to cover up the fact that the entire state was working for the fascist bloc, but on the basis of real military successes and victims, it must be admitted that among the "Resistances" the German was still the main one: the "Red Chapel", oriented towards Moscow, and the "Black Chapel" - diplomats, senior officials, field marshals, generals.

134 Igor Shumeiko

In 1938, they, led by Beck and Brauchitsch, prepared the overthrow of Hitler. Field Marshals Beck, Kleist, adviser to the Bosch AG concern Gerdler, meeting with senior British officials and diplomats, guaranteed that they would put an end to the dictatorship if Great Britain intervened militarily on the Czech issue.

The Berlin police chief and Field Marshal Witzleben, commander of the 3rd Berlin military district, rehearsed the capture of the Reich Chancellery. Even the SS took a wait-and-see attitude. All diplomats and correspondents noticed a strange stupor in Berlin. "People in the city stop using the Germanic greeting, throw out their hand, and return to the old forms," notes Rudolf Hess. For two months, "the coin stood on its edge," and, as the conspirators of 1944 admitted before their execution, only the "Munich Summit," the main foreign and domestic political trump card, saved Hitler. In the next attempt of the "Black Chapel", undertaken in June 1944, it came to street fighting in Berlin. But these are only two direct attempts to overthrow Hitler, and the German Resistance in other forms continued throughout the war.

Incidentally, Stauffenberg, Chief of Staff of the Reserve Army, who flew in to report to the Fuhrer with a briefcase of explosives, illustrates not only the thesis of this chapter: worthy Germans, like the French and Czechs, also resisted the Fuhrer. The second, already unexpected illustration: Klaus Schenk von Stauffenberg. veteran, crippled leg, without right hand, without two fingers on the left, without an eye, informs the Fuhrer on July 20, 1944 about resistance in the West. That the number of Germans fighting in France at that moment was incommensurable with the number of those fighting in Russia, this is also recognized by Western historians. But as a symbol of a qualitative relationship, the three left fingers of the chief of staff, in my opinion. fit quite well.

World War II. Reboot 185

I now venture to offer one, I admit it. an indirect method for assessing the strength of the Resistance: according to "the failure of the top German leadership."

Field Marshal General - the highest rank, after the Reichsmarschall, in the Wehrmacht. In the entire history of the Third Reich, there was only one Reichsmarshal (Goering), field marshals as Baku commissars - 26, including 19 in the ground forces. can say a lot.

Were in service until the end of the war, four:

Von Bush,

Von Weichs an dem Glon,

Keitel,

Scherner (the last commander of the Army Group "Center" did not have time to take the post of commander-in-chief, 05/07/1945 was surrounded by Prague).

Dismissed, eight: (lines in brackets: for what? whose efforts?).

Von Brauchitsch - resigned on December 6, 1941 (the day after the attack near Moscow) and was dismissed on December 19, 1941.

Von Bock - dismissed 07/15/1942 (at the time of the battle near Voronezh).

Von Blomberg - fired 01/25/1938 (sexual scandal. wife turned out to be a prostitute and pornographic actress).

Von Kuchler - dismissed on 01/31/1944 (commander of the Army Group "North", defeat near Leningrad).

Manstein - dismissed 03/30/1944 (after the battles in Cherkassy).

Von Leeb - Dismissed 01/16/1942 (corps from his Army Group. "Sever" was surrounded near Demyansk).

List - dismissed on September 9, 1942 (at the time of the attack on the North Caucasus).

180 Igor Shumeiko

Von Runstedt - dismissed 03/09/1945 (at the time of the fighting on the Rhine).

Killed, captured, three:

Von Reichenau - 01/12/1942 (commander of Army Group Center, heart attack in Poltava, delivered to Germany dead).

Model - committed suicide on 04/21/1945 (troops surrounded by allies).

Paulus - taken prisoner 01/31/1943 in Stalingrad.

Knocked out by the German Resistance:

Von Kleistg - arrested 07/20/1944 for "failure to report on the conspiracy".

Von Witzleben - executed 08/08/1944.

Von Kluge committed suicide on August 18, 1944.

Rommel - committed suicide on 10/14/1944.

As you can see, the German Resistance disabled four field marshals, which is more than their losses on the battlefield (three).

And to the results of the Resistance should be added:

Admiral Canaris, chief of the Abwehr - executed in 1945.

Chief of Staff of the 30s. Colonel General von Hammerstein-Ekvard, commander of the 4th Panzer Group Hoepner, Hitler's military adviser Wilhelm Scheilt (repeatedly handed over the most secret plans to the allies), Eduard Wagner - chief quartermaster, head of the supply department of the General Staff, ambassador in Rome Hassel, head of the French military administration Stulpnagel...

The only great success of the Czech Resistance, but also the most grandiose funeral in the history of the Reich, was the assassination of the Reich Protector of Bohemia and Moravia, the chief of the SD, Reinhard Heydrich. Seven Czech-

World War II. Reboot

parachutists parachuted from a British Halifax aircraft (the namesake of one of the main Munich airborne troops) and on May 27, 1942, fired on Heydrich's car, which was heading to the airport to fly to Berlin. The Reichsprotektor rode alone with a driver in his dark green open Mercedes, known throughout the Czech Republic. (Which indirectly speaks of calm in his protectorate.) Actually, the shooters did not hit, but Heydrich ordered to stop the car, he wanted to personally shoot the saboteurs. One of them threw a grenade. The mortally wounded Heydrich writhed in the street for a long time, passers-by and tram passengers looked at him with horror. When Heydrich was nevertheless taken to the hospital, the agony continued for another 8 hours. What may have added to the Fuhrer's fury was the strange and controversial statement by the doctors that the fragments of the grenade were also poisoned. Heydrich was riddled with these fragments, the spleen had to be removed, and some doctors explain some chemical changes in the blood by this amputation, and not by "unknown bacteria." In Berlin, as the diplomat Gisevius recalls, the most "grand and terrible Babylonian funeral ceremony" took place. The entire Czech Republic was forced to observe mourning, and the mining settlement of Lidice (in our country, for some reason, more often called a village) was completely destroyed in retaliation, all men over 15 were shot, women and children were sent to concentration camps.

But the real Czech Resistance, the revival of the national spirit, the first moment when an armed Czech in national military uniform openly stood up against an armed German. These are the actions of the First Czechoslovak Corps, formed in the USSR and taking its place in the ranks in the battles on the Dukla Pass.

Indeed, let's think about all three categories of those who resisted in that war: Soldier, Partisan, Underground worker. That the last two usually go together

138 Igor Shumeiko

chokh that there was a stable verbal cliché: "Underground guerrillas in the occupied countries" — this simplification obscures one fundamental difference. Partisans, albeit in the most remote forests and mountains, are still a more open, "semi-state" challenge, a different psychology than that of the underground.

The underground is probably the highest rise of personal heroism - but it is personal. The life environment of an underground worker is a sea of conquered people, the townsfolk. The form of life is a mimicry for the layman. His resistance is not yet the revival of the mass national spirit. He is an Avenger, but not yet a Protector. Philosophically speaking, what awaits the consciousness of the people of the occupied country? Restoration of the situation: "before the war", "before the defeat". And the situation was as follows: Defender (Soldier) - it is known for sure that he is, but his activity should not be here, but closer to the borders (they are fighting, preparing, standing guard). Here, in the capital, in peaceful cities, the Defender can only be: A participant in parades, Caring for a girl - MI ... And yet, the Defender carries weapons openly. And generally speaking, Protect, (Shield, stand between the protected and the Enemy) can only be open. Revenge - whatever.

And the activities of the Underground, on the contrary, are nearby, in a neighboring house (explosions, murders of traitors). He does not carry the Weapon openly. From the point of view of the Everyman, the Undergrounder is the same Everyman, only more desperate. More perception options: marginal, evil, having nothing to lose, ruthless, irresponsible, impudent.

A partisan, according to this logic, is still almost a Defender, almost a Soldier.

The purpose of this "philosophical digression" about the difference between the Warrior and Podpolitsik, the Defender and the Avenger is to emphasize that the Nervous Czech Defenders of the Czech Republic, who revived its spirit, its national pride, are the fighters of the USSR formed in the 44th year on the Dukla Pass. First Czechoslovak Corps.

World War II. Reboot

And those who killed Heydrich are, of course, outstanding heroes, but it is the Avengers. And one more thing to add: after all, these were only partly Czech underground workers, and partly - an English sabotage detachment, paratroopers.

The choice line split Yugoslavia. At the first stages, the leading role in the resistance was played by the Serbian Chetniks of General Draže Mihailović.

When Stalin demanded on 4 September 1941 that the Western Allies open a front in the Balkans to "draw 30-40 divisions from the Eastern Front," Churchill envisioned the Chetnik uprising as a replacement for this Balkan front. He told the Soviet leadership that the British allies, the Serbs, at the British request, were already pinning down several dozen divisions of the Axis states. In addition, they organized a partisan army, which, despite difficult relations with the Chetniks (it even came to direct clashes), numbered up to 650,000 thousand people by the autumn of 1944 and attracted three German army groups of 400 thousand people, armed with 2130 guns and mortars, 125 tanks and assault guns, 352 combat aircraft. Plus, Tito's actions fettered 190,000 German allies. In Yugoslavia, the German allies were Croats and Muslims.

On April 10, 1941, the Independent State of Croatia (IHC) was proclaimed in Zagreb, which included the Croatian lands of Bosnia and Herzegovina proper. Ante Pavelić became the Poglavnik (leader) of Croatia, and two representatives of Bosnian Muslims entered the government of independent Croatia. 11 April, on the basis of the law on the army and navy, the armed forces of the NGH began to be created.

"Führer's Table Talk" dated [October 3, 194] records Hitler's impressions of the meeting with the Croatian

Igor Shumeiko

Minister of War Kvaternik: "And when I see him, I see the same racial type. devoted, unwaveringly true to his word. They (Croats) claim that in fact they are the descendants of the Goths, the fact that they speak Slavic is some kind of misunderstanding. And it is not clear why the Fuhrer adds: "If Croatia were part of the Reich, we would entrust them with the protection of the swamps (!)».

According to Churchill, the war between the Serbs and the Croats turned into "a bloody vendetta with mutual executions." But the main atrocities of that time, like barrels of gouged out eyes, belong to them, the failed German "marsh guards".

The "Muslim volunteer formations" in the Balkans included four Albanian rifle regiments, a fascist militia battalion and a gendarmerie under the command of General Prek Prevesi. In addition, the armed formations of the organization "Va! KootbkKag", created at the end of 1942 in the south of Albania, the regiment "Regiment of Kosova", formed in 1943 in Kosovska Mitrovica. The Albanian militia was also subordinate to the German authorities.

In February 1943, Himmler ordered the formation of divisions of the SS troops from Bosnian Muslim volunteers to conduct anti-partisan operations in Yugoslavia. The 13th SS Mountain Division "Handshar" was formed, which originally had the name "Bosnia-Herzegovina". The level of training of volunteers was low, and in September 1943 the division was sent for retraining to France. German officers treated their Muslim charges with contempt. As a result, they rebelled and killed several German officers. The rebellion was crushed, the instigators were executed, but the division, the only SS formation that ever rebelled, was not disbanded. In February 1944, the division was sent to

Yugoslavia, where she took part in the battles with the partisans in the Brcko region (spring 1944) and where she gained a sinister reputation for her cruelties.

In January 1944, the recruitment of Bosnian Muslims to the 23rd Mountain Rifle Division "Kama" was announced. In April 1944, Himmler ordered the formation of another division, this time from Kosovo Albanians, the 21st Skanderbeg Mountain Division. By August 1944, the division was fully formed, consisting of 6.5 thousand people. The division was considered fit only for police actions.

The divisions were given many privileges, such as, for example, special rations and permission to perform religious rites. This privilege was contrary to the anti-religious ideology of the SS, but Himmler told Goebbels that he "had nothing against Islam because it promises Muslims paradise if they die in battle – a religion very pragmatic and attractive to soldier"

At the end of 1944, the retreat of German troops from the Balkans began. The Muslim volunteers were considered useless for fighting on the front line, and in September 1944 the Muslim units of the division were disbanded.

III AMATEUR INQUIRIES Why so much detail specifically about Yugoslav affairs?

And it's simply impossible not to notice the amazing resemblance, but what's there! - one hundred percent coincidence of sympathies and antipathies of "United (by Hitler) Europe" in 1941-1944 and "United (by Clinton) Europe" in 1992-1999. Ethnic cleansing was (generally admitted) carried out by all three parties, but the choice was unequivocal. Among the Croats and Muslims, a dozen field commanders were convicted, among the Serbs, the entire state. It's as if it's in their genes – some have the determination to rise up, to go against the opinion of all of Europe, as in March 1941. Other

Igor Shumeiko

a complex, viscous-heavy mixture of feelings, but, I would venture to suggest, both a certain irritation and a secret envy towards the "decided", "we will not take into account the opinion and choice of all Europe", in short, towards the "others". Maybe this irritated memory of a Frenchman that "it was he who regularly fed a German in 1941 (remember that annual duty: 750,000 tons of wheat, 140,000 tons of meat, 650 million liters of milk, 220 million liters of wine), when these reckless Serbs...", and led France to participate in the 1999 Vanti-Yugoslav war?

Chapter 15 And where was the nobleman then? (Baltic abacus)

I think it has long been clear to readers that the main target of my pamphlet is the so-called "policy of double standards." This topic is now, of course, one of the most popular on the lips of presidents, deputies, diplomats, historians, political scientists. Struggle for justice in assessing the history of the twentieth century. Although there is a certain terminological paradox in relation to the assessments of wars: here the source of all injustice lies precisely in ... the "policy of one standard". It sounds unusual, even wild, but think about it: the same standard is applied and applied to Russia at war as to the behavior of France, the Czech Republic, which were already at peace in 1941.

The essence, of course, remains - injustice. Double (different) standards are applied to one (identical) act, to other actions, events (fundamentally different). — on the contrary, they use the same one... With great difficulty, recognition of this was wrested from US President George W. Bush in a 2005 water interview. On the occasion of the sixtieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War, his big tour of Europe was timed. On May 6-10, the President visited Latvia and Georgia "... taking part in the ceremonial

| Igor Shumeiko

events dedicated to the newfound independence of Latvia and the success of the peaceful Rose Revolution in Georgia”.

The seriousness of the topic touched on, the level of the person who gave the ratings, require an appropriate attitude to this text. Therefore, the interview is reproduced in the revised version of the Bureau of International Information Programs (BIPP) of the US Department of State. The questions mostly belong to the correspondent of the NTV television company.

QUESTION: Good morning, Mr. President, although for the Russian audience it is good evening because of the time difference. Your father is a World War II hero, the youngest Navy pilot. How important is Victory Day for you personally and for your family?

PRESIDENT: Thank you for asking about my dad. Like many in America and Russia, he was among those called upon to defend the world from Nazism. And, fortunately, he returned home. And today the holiday in Russia will remind us all of the sacrifices made in my case by the person I love, but also by a whole generation of men and women who made extraordinary efforts to protect their homeland in the case of Russia, in the case of America, to work with allies to defeat Adolf Hitler as well as the Japanese. For me personally, this is a special day. because it reminds me of a young guy's willingness to fight. But it also reminds me of my generation's duty to work together to make the world a better place.

QUESTION: The contours of post-war Europe changed in accordance with the outcome of the Yalta Conference in 1943, a decision taken by three very important personalities of that time - Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin. How fair is it to hold Russia alone responsible for all the misfortunes of Eastern Europe and the Baltic states?

World War II. Reboot

PRESIDENT: A very fair question. This decision was made at the end of the war. I think the main complaint is that the form of power under which the Baltic countries had to live was not chosen by them. But there is no doubt that the three leaders made the decision.

QUESTION: So, not only Russia is a negative character in history?

THE PRESIDENT: I think everyone, when historians look back at Yalta, should be aware that not only - you are correct in pointing this out - not only the Russian leader, but also the British and American leaders were sitting at the table and agreeing .

QUESTION: In Russia, we are very concerned about the growth of neo-Nazism in the Baltic States, when Russian war veterans are publicly humiliated, when monuments to Russian soldiers are desecrated, and at the same time, in May, it is planned to open a monument to the Nazi brigade, which is well known not only by military actions against the Russians, but also rather vile things that were common for the SS troops.

PRESIDENT: Yes. When I go to the Baltic countries, I will be able to say this: it is important to respect democracy, but respecting democracy means respecting the rights of minorities. In other words, true democracy proclaims that minorities are important and that the will of the majority cannot suppress the minority. As for whether countries honor Nazism, of course, this should be rejected. Nazism was defeated. We are celebrating the defeat of Nazism. We do not want Nazism to return. The extremist point of view is that it is possible to violate the rights of minorities. The Nazis exterminated millions of Jews, for example, and this is a classic example of how the rights of minorities were violated. And we must never forget the lessons of why we fought together during World War II. Therefore, I look forward to making this call for tolerance.

Igor Shumeiko

QUESTION: A question that has nothing to do with your visit to Russia, but is very important for our country as an oil-producing country. You once mentioned that you would be happy to find a magic wand and lower the price of oil. What price of oil would be acceptable to the United States, and what do you think is the chance of finding this magic wand?

PRESIDENT: No, there is no magic wand. The soldier asked me: why don't you lower the price of gasoline? It's like the government controls prices. In my country, the government does not control prices. And I told him: if I had a magic wand, I would wave it and lower your prices, but this is not done. The price is based on supply and demand. And demand in relation to supply is growing, and this is beneficial for oil-producing countries like Russia. I don't know what the correct price is. Of course, the lower the better for our economy, because every time more dollars are spent on gasoline, money is leaving workers' wallets. But that's how the economy works. Let's hope the higher price stimulates production growth. Then the increase in production will help bring the price into balance. The market is what it is. The market decides, not the government. I would hope that Russia will encourage large investments to unlock the huge reserves it has. We need to do more exploration here. I spoke to the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia, who assured me that he was trying to find more oil. That's what high prices do. But people who have oil need to understand that if the price gets too high, it could undermine the economy, which means less purchasing power for the product.

Good, calm and frank conversation. The president, the son of a front-line president, did justice to his former ally, and just at the time when the great

World War II. Reboot

many individuals, organizations and countries, mostly US clients, competed in attacking Russia. In essence, this interview with George W. Bush raised three interesting questions: 1) The Yalta model of the world order. 2) World War II as a struggle for minority rights and tolerance. 3) Oil.

Only the first question is directly related to the topic of this chapter (War and Justice), but somehow it was a pity to interrupt George W. Bush. Quite frank (for any politician) conversation. However, questions No. 2 and No. 3 (minority rights and oil) will still have a chance to be touched upon, but for now, here is the answer to all Russophobes of the Baltics, the Czech Republic, etc.: the division of Europe into spheres of influence is a joint decision of the allies, this a necessary, universally recognized security measure in Europe. Imagine: the bank tellers had a button to call the security, but they were afraid to press it at the time of the attack (Lithuania did not dare to turn to the guarantor countries, allowing Hitler to go through a significant part of his path - still within the framework of international law). This means that another system was needed, which Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin worked on.

Thus, Bush recognized Western co-authorship in the "Yalta project", but he could not scoop out the whole Baltic "puddle of hostility" with this. Of the heads of state who received him, everyone remembers the President of Latvia, Vaira Vike-Freiberga, who betrayed her feelings not only by her actual patronage of SS veterans, but also by the following Passage: "... they will spread their vodka and herring on newspapers and will not sing their songs, remember how they conquered Latvia (about Russian veterans) ›...

Reference. The First Occupation Museum appeared in Riga in 1993. Created on the site of the former Museum of Red Latvian Riflemen. The main purpose of the museum is "to testify to what happened to Latvia and the Latvian people during the reign of the occupation authorities in 1940-1991."

Igor Shumeiko

Most of the exposition is devoted to the period from 1940 to 1946. The process of incorporating Latvia into the USSR is shown, followed by the period of the German occupation. The "Hitler" exposition is several times smaller than the paintings of the "Soviet occupation". And "Soviet history" in Riga

so much is collected that in 2005 the museum decided to expand - construction work should be completed in 2008. Now the average attendance of the museum is about 400 people a day.

In 2005, the Occupation Museum in Riga was visited by the Russian and Russian Ambassador to Latvia Viktor Kalyuzhny. His assessment (left in the visitor's book): "the exposition is very one-sided, only one period of the history of Latvia sticks out - the Soviet one, but the ion is depicted exclusively in black colors".

In addition to the exposition itself, there is also a "circle of interests" in the building. Almost every goal | April, the museum hosts an evening of anti-Soviet jokes. The Latvian authorities are very proud of their museum. For example, the President of Latvia, Vaira Vike-Freiberga, visiting the Apartheid Museum in Johannesburg (South Africa), told its staff that "there is a similar Museum of Occupation in Latvia" and expressed hope for a possible exchange of experience.

Ten years after the opening of the Museum of the Occupation in Riga, a similar museum was opened in Tallinn, where among the exhibits there are also "objects and documents related to the repressions against the civilian population of Estonia and deportations to Siberia in 1944 and 1949." According to the authorities. The project, which cost \$2.5 million, was financed by Olga Kistler-Ritso, a US citizen of Estonian origin, who left her homeland in 1944. For her help in opening the museum, she was awarded the highest award of the capital of the country - the "Emblem of Tallinn".

Yes, during the tour of 2005, the Whiteington principal explained some of the history of the Second World War to his Baltic clients, but

World War II. Reboot

serve yet and "occupation of the times of tsarist Russia" – here, for explaining this, one very well known, especially to Protestants, slogan, which was put above in the title, will come in handy.

AMATEUR INQUIRIES Where was the nobleman then? And what does the "nobleman" have to do with it?

It was in the era of feudalism that the disciples of Wycliffe, basing all their social criticism on the Bible, put forward that famous, absolutely understandable thesis, "slogan": "When Adam plowed the land and Eve spun, where was the nobleman then?" This thesis has entered the very fabric of Protestant culture, and I think there will be nothing offensive in using it to illustrate the next historical alignment.

Riga (which today, under the rule of President Vaira Vike-Freiberga, who complained about Russia in Johannesburg, fits the definition of "apartheid"), well, this Riga was founded as a German city. And it remained so for many centuries. Latvians (Livs, Latgaliens) could bring food to the markets, but they had no right to stay in the city overnight. More precisely, they had, if they could show a certificate that they were servants in German houses, and "workers of merry houses" (famous throughout Northern ... Europe). There were no Latvian quarters in Riga, but besides the German quarters there were Jewish quarters. It was the second main national community in the city (from this memory, most likely, the special diligence of the Latvian SS men in the work on the "final solution"). And at the moment when Peter the Great and the Swedes were deciding their affairs at the Nystadt Congress, any political Latvian nation simply did not exist. There was just a Swedish province, among whose peasants the Livs statistically predominated ... and that was all.

Igor Shumeiko

So, the question is: "in the 18th century, when Janis was tending pigs and Marta was washing the floors, where was the Latvian sovereign (or senator, or at least the Latvian burgomaster of Riga) then?"

And in no case are we talking about any cultural backwardness of the Latvian nation – we are talking about its absence. (As agricultural personnel, the population of Livonia was just distinguished by diligence, neatness and, on the whole, a higher culture of production.)

The essentially Latvian merchant class, the intelligentsia, the "Latvian political nation" were formed in the bosom of the Russian Empire. But I wonder what would have happened to them (the Latvian nation) if Hitler had won? His chief adviser on "racial organization" was precisely Rosenberg, an Ostsee German, and "that explains a lot" (as another slogan says). In any case, it would have to explain a lot to fifteen generations of his servants and maids. Well, they would burn all the Jews, well, would have done some more work - how long after that would they have entrusted you with the "Schmeisers" to show off?

Necessary explanation. The above applies only to the Latvian fascists. And only two postulates can be addressed to the entire Latvian nation: 1) tsarist Russia did not take away sovereignty from you 2) the USSR - yes, it did take Latvian sovereignty, but...

But I would suggest to Latvian historians to take a somewhat new look and objectively evaluate the following. Yes, sovereignty was taken away in 1940 and returned in 1991. The aberration of historical vision here is as follows: now National Sovereignty, International Law, Human Life seem to be such Absolute Values that this sensation seems to be transferred to 1940. But in reality, all these securities have their own floating rates. And what was the specific cost of National Sovereignty in that year, 1940, you'd better ask your Baltic neighbors – the Danes, for example. Or Icelandic...

World War II. Reboot

In 1991, of course, things were different. It's all the same that ... They picked up a bird in December - they released it in April. True, there was one more mutual burden: the construction of this strange socialism, which was not built in any way, was not "conquered". Either the Latvian riflemen helped us conquer it, or we did it to them, but it's all to no avail ... But this is only history (and not the closest one) that will judge and explain.

And another point on which I, I confess, do not have final information, and which, it seems, has never been discussed yet. I suggest thinking about the following fact: already by 1943, Latvia was under Germany twice as long as in the USSR, but... The question, in fact, is this: if we compare the presence (or absence) of heavy weapons in the national units that fought on both sides of the front? Perhaps such a formulation of the question will seem atypical, even strange, but such is the general style of this book of mine: periodically interspersing ideological and abstract passages with purely material and mercantile ones, like: how many tanks the Czechs riveted to the Germans, how many millions of liters of milk and wine they gave them French...

M AMATEUR INQUIRIES But really, who gave out, and who did not, tanks and guns to the Latvian units?

The question of the presence of heavy weapons in the national units and, in general, the presence of Latvian pilots, artillerymen, and tankers seems to me to be very important and indicative. Light armament alone testifies to the predominantly punitive purpose of the detachments, and also testifies to mistrust. Auto-matchers, "cannon fodder" to disarm, take under control, transfer somewhere easier than, for example, a military unit, a formation with artillery assigned to them,

Igor Shumeiko

tanks. I repeat, I do not have complete information - only archival research of the most popular in the era of perestroika, the Latvian magazine Rodnik. So, the Germans, it seems, gave the Latvians only "Schmeisers" and those same SS (or Gestapo?) badges that Waffen-SS veterans are so proud of at parades. And the USSR formed the 130th Latvian Corps, which received the Order of Suvorov for the capture of Riga. And the badges - what the badges?! - they hung around the German shepherds on collars ...

So, two questions. What are all the same: 1) the comparative cost of National sovereignty at the rate of 1940 and 1991; 2) comparative measures of confidence, recognition of the Latvian nation in such an original, but also genuine (especially in wartime) dimension, like access to heavy weapons?

And returning to the world of ideas. If you do not indulge in some kind of geographical dreams: oh, if it were not the Baltic, but the warm Mediterranean Sea, and, most importantly. on the other side of the Iron Curtain! Or chronological dreams: oh, if after May 1945 ... suddenly and immediately December 1991. (The USSR accepts the capitulation of Germany and immediately announces its dissolution! It would be great... after all, there is a proverb About the "Moor", Russians would do just that...)

Perhaps it was on the basis of such "literary dreams" that the Commission of Latvian Historians was created.

Note: The Commission of Latvian Historians was founded [November 3, 1998 on the initiative of the former president of the country, G. Ulmanis. It began its work at the end of 1998 with 11 members. The Commission included professional historians from the Institute of History of the University of Latvia, the Faculty of History and Philosophy of the University of Latvia, the State Historical Archive, the Museum of the Occupation, and employees of the Chancellery of the President of the country. The chairman of the commission is the director of the Institute of History, professor Andris Caune. In cooperation with the Ministry

World War II. Reboot

Foreign Affairs, foreign members of the Commission were selected and included in the Commission. Meetings of the Commission with the participation of foreign members are held twice a year. The involvement of foreign scientists and public figures contributes to the objectivity of the work of the Commission, and also makes it possible to become better acquainted with the historical research methods developed in the West.

The main task of the Commission is to study and comprehend the topic "Crimes against humanity during the two occupations of 1940-1956." and organization of the development of the final report.

Four working groups have been created, acting independently of each other in the following areas:

1. Crimes against humanity in the territory of Latvia in 1940-1941. (supervisor prof. V. Berzins);
2. Holocaust in Latvia 1941-1944 (supervisor prof. A. Strang);
3. Crimes against humanity in the territory of Latvia during the Nazi occupation of 1941-1944. (supervisor prof. I. Feldmanis).
4. Crimes against humanity in Latvia during the Soviet occupation of 1944-1956. (supervisor prof. H. Strods).

Our deputy of the State Duma of the Russian Federation, Deputy Chairman of the Committee on International Affairs of the State Duma Natalia Narochninkaya, in 2005 congratulating the President of the Republic of Latvia, Mrs. Vaira Vike-Freiberge. wrote to her:

"This Victory saved the Latvian people from disappearing from world history, from the fate of turning from a nation into a faceless human material, into servants for the masters from the Third Reich, who can barely read German geo-

| Igor Shumeiko

graphic signs in Ingermanland. In the subsequent period, Latvians, like Russians and other peoples of the historical Russian state, experienced their share of everything that was in our

common Fatherland — good and bad, but they became professors, inventors and generals, received state awards for their achievements in national culture, and preserved themselves as a nation.

I sincerely hope that the Latvian people, with their wisdom and dignity, will overcome the stage of self-affirmation on the grounds of indiscriminate denial of the past and enmity towards Russia..."

And in continuation of this just and conciliatory letter, which, unfortunately, remained unanswered, I will give brief excerpts from the work of the Commission of Historians of Latvia with my own, conciliatory, I hope, commentary.

1. Abstract of Professor Inesis Feldmanis. "The occupation policy of Nazi Germany in Latvia in the light of German archival documents".

..the issue of autonomy for Latvia and Estonia. In the autumn of 1943, some high officials of the Nazis, for example, Reichsführer SS G. Himmler, expressed the idea of the need to give Latvia and Estonia state independence. This idea was ardently supported by the chief of the SS Main Directorate G. Berger, as well as the General Commissar of Latvia O. Drexler. The Ministry of the Occupied Eastern Districts even prepared a draft Führer Decree on the state independence of Latvia and Estonia, and Minister A. Rosenberg ordered to develop a plan for the liquidation of the Reichskommissariat "Ozlap4". In turn, some German diplomats advised presenting the act of granting autonomy to Latvia and Estonia as a response to the conference of foreign ministers held in Moscow in October 1943. At the disposal of the German times

World War II. Reboot

Vedka received information that at this conference the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Great Britain and the USAA. Eden and K. Hull 4th Gasteau recognized the inclusion of the Baltic countries in the USSR ...

On the other hand, the idea of autonomy had powerful opponents. Reichskommissar H. Lohse and German Foreign Minister Ribbentrop opposed the granting of autonomy to Latvia and Estonia. Many documents testify that it was Ribbentrop's position that had a great influence on Hitler, who finally made a negative decision...

'Mr. Feldmanis, your essay honestly and vividly illustrates the very course of the Germans' thinking about: "Shouldn't we give the Latvians autonomy?" All THEIR "pro and contra" are given. Agree that not only in the quoted fragments, but also everywhere the spirit reigns... I would say this: ... a completely official, "applied" understanding of the Latvian autonomy by the Germans (for example, in defiance of the decisions of 1943 of the Allies in Moscow). And if you add Van! abstract with another completely unambiguous assessment of Hitler: "The independence of the Baltic states and Ukraine in 1919 is the work of our (German) hands"?

How can you argue? In 1918, the Germans squeezed the Russian, and then the Red Army out of the Baltic States, and for purely economic needs, for better organization of the work of the rear, they declare the "independence" of Latvia and Estonia. That is probably why they so easily returned it (Baltic "independence") to Russia under the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact: "Baltic sovereignties" are our pro- duction, we gave it, we re-gifted it to whom we wanted ! And in 1943, if we want, we will give it back to the Latvians!

Agree that such "sovereignty" is one of the bargaining (and rather small) German coins - pfennig. This is not something to be proud of and on which to base Russia's space accounts for 1940.

E Igor Shumeiko

2. Lecture by Dr. Irene Schneidere "The policy of the occupation regime of the Soviet Union in Latvia: in the light of Russian archives" (summary).

"... Only thanks to the financial support of the Commission of Historians, after a long break, Latvian historians managed to "return" to the archives of Moscow. They could not only work with documents there, but also order copies. Scientists get acquainted with the received materials, the documents are published and widely used in scientific articles. However, I would like to start not with a review of documents, but with a brief description of the conditions in which I had to work. Work in the archives of Moscow, unfortunately, cannot be called normal for a number of reasons. My observations stem from the experience gained as a result of the trips of the last three years.

Has anything changed in the work of archives since the 1980s? As far as I can tell, little, if anything, has changed. Yes, the former Central Party Archive, which had previously been practically closed to researchers, became available. Now this archive is called the Russian State Archive of Socio-Political History (GASPI).

I would like to say a few words about the specific aspects of the work. I'll start with those circumstances that complicate the work. The work of historians is influenced by the personal attitude of archive staff towards them. Muscovites are great patriots, so they certainly believe their mayor Yuri Luzhkov, who talks about apartheid, the infringement of Russians in Latvia. Powerful propaganda has an impact on the inhabitants of the capital of Russia.

Since the last years of the Boris Yeltsin era, declassification commissions have not been working in the archives. Strange things happen to secret documents. In the former Central Party Archive there is a fund 600 - the bureau of the Central Committee of the VKGIlb), which in the first post-war years "looked after", then

World War II. Reboot

there are controlled, power structures in the Latvian SSR. The fund contains 28 cases, of which 10 are not available to researchers. However, it turned out that they were issued to some foreign researchers. This can be judged from the footnotes in the works of our foreign colleagues. Absolutely not understandable differentiated approach.

The working conditions are also bad: microfilms are very difficult to read, the number of cases ordered is unreasonably small (only 5 cases).

At the same time, I would like to emphasize that, for example, in SASPI, the work is greatly facilitated by a carefully compiled inventory, already by the name of the case one can judge whether there will be something about Latvia. This certainly makes the job easier. especially with such a huge fund size.

After such a not very optimistic introduction, the question arises: was there any point in going, wasting time, money, nerves? The answer is yes three times. Valuable, even unique documents about Latvia during the Soviet occupation were obtained from the archives of Moscow.

... The plan of socialist construction included the deportation of the "foreign element", the collectivization of agriculture, and special attention was paid to the fight against the church. There is only one conclusion that can be drawn - the work must be continued, because the archives of Moscow are just beginning to reveal their secrets.

... In my opinion. significant documents revealing the processes of 1940-1941. and the real intentions of Moscow are kept in the V. Molotov fund. I would like to note only one point: in June 1940, the leadership of Moscow expected armed resistance to the Soviet occupation, but not from the army, but from the Aizsargs. This, to a certain extent, explains why mass repressions were carried out against the members of this organization..."

And your lecture. Ms. Irene Schneidere, bears a share of a completely fair assessment of the current working conditions of historians in Russia. Even if Russian archivists

Igor Shumeiko

you are angry with the Latvian discrimination against their compatriots in Riga and somehow you are discriminated against — all the same, you must admit that this is not some kind of “conspiracy of total lies” in the spirit of Orwell’s “Ministry of Truth”?!

“The fund contains 28 cases, of which 10 are not available to researchers (Latvian). However, it turned out that they were issued to some foreign researchers. This can be judged from the footnotes in the works of our foreign colleagues. Absolutely incomprehensible differentiated an approach”.

That's exactly what differentiated, and not "total"! That is, if Russia thought of, let's say, tightly hiding some information, creating a fake and using it to carry out some kind of disinformation anti-Latvian attack – how can all this be built on closing the archives only for Latvians and... preserving the access of the Americans and shvelov?! After all, having taken “these secrets” from them, you parry such a (hypothetical) attack even more confidently...

In general, is the fate of one Baltic republic really so terrible, which bloodlessly lost its sovereignty and regained it without a single shot, to the singing of beautiful folk songs of a nationwide million-strong choir? The whole world then broadcast the “singing Latvian revolution”. (By the way, do they sing at the stadiums now? It's also interesting: are hundreds of thousands going to sing simply now, without protests?) After all, there is a unique pattern, beauty in such a fate. And if some Latvian suddenly reads the book up to this point (despite the phrases on the previous two pages, which may seem offensive), then perhaps he will say: here it is, the propaganda of “stupid Russian resignation to fate.”

But it was precisely the aristocrat of the spirit, Friedrich Nietzsche, who formulated the main conclusion (slogan) of his philosophy in relation to a person/society in this way: “Amor fati (love of fate)” And gave an explanation (which turned out, among other things,

World War II. Reboot

also the most accurate forecast for our entire 20th century): “There is nothing more terrible than the class of barbarian slaves who have learned to treat their existence as an injustice and who are preparing to avenge not only for themselves, but for all generations.” To carry such a disease within oneself and overcome it—isn't that a high destiny?

No, a real reproach, which should be feared in line with the topic “The Second World War. Rebooting” is not “stupid resignation to fate”, it is a reproach of a completely different kind. Approximately so it has already been voiced more than once: “/ It turns out that if Russia, the only country that held the front against Hitler, will always and forever be right: in Yalta-45, and in Prague-68, and all your stupid politicians will always they are right in everything, and we will have to sow corn in Kurzeme together with them, and build socialism in Afghanistan, etc.... then how will Russia be better than the German yoke we have escaped»

Chapter 16 War and Justice (Six feathers from each goose of the kingdom)

The first, “surface layer” of this syllogism (“Then why is the USSR better than Hitler?”) is purely demagogic, almost journalistic overlap, easily refuted. Comparing our mistakes to Hitler's Thousand-Year Plan is the logic of an offended, angry, and very narrow-minded child. “Here they will burn all these, and those. and even those, and only then - all. And they will open in Auschwitz and Salaspils - mmm ... Luna Park! Or... "Hitlerland" with ice cream...

But there is also a "second layer", wow - real and most difficult questions. Where does the right of the breaker end? What is a "just order of the world"? And how do the “post-war years” slowly turn into... “pre-war years”? Countries that have not been at war, they can, of course, liken the world to a pretty, plump girl rescued from a fire, with a gallant bow given to her parents. and that's all... You can only... except leave your phone number to your parents, but

so, unobtrusively: "Call, how is our rescued..." But how to realize the true limits of responsibility? When (and where) did the inner rightness and justice of the USSR disappear?

World War II. Reboot 2

So, the imperfection and injustice of Versailles and Munich pushed to the beginning of the Great War. The Soviet Union, like an ancient hero, took upon itself all the blows of fate, all the evil and all the responsibility - and won. And who here was going to build a system on the "eternal gratitude of the saved"? Certainly not such a wise politician as Stalin. All his post-war speeches, reports, even toasts ("For the great Russian people!") are carefully codified and studied long ago. But there are two of his "immediately post-war" statements that seem to me the most visionary and directly related to the enumerated difficult issues. They, these statements, are also, in general, known, certified by many witnesses, but, however, they were not included in any collection of his works. That is why they are cited by witnesses "not to the point, not to the comma", something like this:

1. "In this war, we lost the best. And it will certainly have an impact."
2. "Without theory, we will perish."

It is clear why the "neighbors", who were in charge of shorthand and publishing the "Collected Works of I.V. Stalin", never included the ss "Apocrypha" anywhere. They just were - from the "unlost ..."

But before touching on these very ... "not the best of not the best" - both the corn guardian and the collector of gold stars - let's return first to the title.

. "six feathers from every goose of the kingdom (War and Justice)"

Being well aware of how boring the reader has become over the past 25 years with these above-mentioned images of "not lost, not the best", I will try to give at least an example of the opposite sense from a deck that has not yet been erased.

It happened in the era of Henry Nyatoy, the winner at Agincourt, the conqueror of France, the best and most successful king of England (according to most

212 : Igor Shumeiko

British historians). In the Hundred Years Anglo-French War, just then a break came, prudently used by the British to unleash their own small internal, civil war. The reigning Henry Wu pacifies and unites the country again under the slogan: "France will be ours! Those kingdoms in terms of population, mosh, the size of the armies correlated approximately like ... a ferret with a deer. But after some preparation, England (the ferret) rushed in and defeated the deer (temporarily, of course).

And in the history of Henry the Fifth by Desmond Seward, I was struck by one absolutely passing technical detail of the preparation for that great expedition. Archers, as you know, were the main striking force of the British, arrows (more than a million pieces) were harvested and transported in barrels. And then the feathers really served as the plumage of arrows. Exactly the same as the poets, goose. And here is just one line in Steward's book... (hereinafter the routine about measures to prepare the ships): "Henry Nyaty issued a decree: "to the sheriffs in the entire English kingdom to tear out 6 feathers from the wings of every goose *".

Here it is, the idea of military justice in an ingeniously simple form, in the most visual form. "The feudal society of England, as any textbook will tell you, had a very complex structure." Hierarchy of vassalage, a complex system of privileges, but, after all, strictly 3 feathers from each English goose wing. Mobilization of all England. Extremely simple and fair. And even if it turns out that 12 feathers were torn out from some goose, and from some

one, then all of England - correctly - will understand this as an accidental exception, as a crime, corruption ... of the district military commissariats that conducted the draft ... That is, of course, I made a reservation, I wanted to say "sheriffs".

And a few months later, 5,000 English archers scattered at Agincourt a 20,000-strong French army (knights, servants, heralds, squires...).

World War II. Reboot 215

Here is an example of a just, popular (maybe even "Patriotic") war on the part of England. Maybe this definition of mine will again seem unusual ... wild, but here is such a comment. This is unusual for us, Russians, because in our country the concepts of People's War, Patriotic War are connected, inextricably merged with defensive war, "defence", "salvation" of the Fatherland. But for other countries and nations, especially such ... more mobile, mostly coastal, People's, Patriotic wars can also become an aggressive war. The main thing is the presence/absence of an idea that really unites the nation. Capturing prey, capturing new territory... It's hard for us to imagine. THAT "such ideas" can unite the whole people. But then the Scandinavians rose up and captured a third of Europe, founded several kingdoms. The Aragonese rose and captured half of Italy. The Germans - "Drang nach Osten". The Normans rose up and took over England. By the way. and this described case, when they (the Normans), soldering with the British into a new nation, after 400 years, led by Henry the Fifth, captured France, this was noted in the chronicles of the time as "the reconquest of Normandy".

What does this have to do with Russia (apart from any hints and comparisons of the prevailing practice of our "district military commissars" and Heinrich's "sheriffs")?

Of course, any People's War also implies some kind of people's self-organization, but only the "People's Conquest" war requires organization and self-organization two orders of magnitude greater than the "People's Liberation War". We need to gather, dive, move. And most importantly, after the victory in the "People's Conquest" war, it is not necessary to share not only the contents of the captured carts, but also ... land, real estate. And the division of this already implies a new organization of life, work in the occupied territories - otherwise this production has neither meaning nor value.

24 Igor Shumeiko

Henry the Fifth of England won only the title of King of France, and his people received both solid movable and immovable property. And this implies lists, registers, contracts. amendments to rental dens, land cadastres (but when did we hear this ominous word - "land cadastre"?).

The trophies of the people in the also won, but defensive, saving Narol-Patriotic War are only carts, 99% with belongings stolen a little earlier from it, the people. Well, plus some souvenirs from Paris or Berlin. And the division, the redistribution of this kind of booty (called "pull") - it does not require self-organization is more complicated than "Bratkovskaya".

Siberia, conquered by a handful of Cossacks, remained for the people a place of exile and penal servitude. And the Cossacks are just an exception, the only corporation self-organized by the people. And there was this exception precisely because the Cossacks also needed to divide the lands in the lower reaches of the Dnieper, Don, Yaik, settle down, organize life. To complete the picture, I would personally suggest looking at and comparing the Cossacks with the earpieces. Unfortunately, this "corporation" is little known among us, but take my word for it. Absolutely the same courage, enterprise, and even the same tactics. Gathered from Novgorod the Great to, approximately, Novgorod Nizhny gang. They sat down in boats, called only not "boats" (as in Stenka Razin). and "ears", and raided. Their journeys to Astrakhan, Azov were recorded, and there were, for sure, more distant campaigns. But the Ushkuins did not go as far as dividing the land, in view of the then historical (Golden Horde) situation.

And there was no people's memory about the earpieces, and, characteristically, there are no songs left about them. On the other hand, the Cossacks themselves, having detached themselves from their villages for a long time, became slightly similar to ... that's right, to the same earpieces. Remember Stenka Razin.

World War II. Reboot 25

So, it must be admitted that we had no experience of conquering People's campaigns. And, as a result, they had no experience in organizing civil life in the conquered countries. This is not a natural defect (the Cossacks just prove that such necessary natural abilities were present in the nation) - this, as they say, is a "historical reality". Therefore, having saved themselves and the world from Napoleon/Hitler, having accomplished a bunch of heroic deeds, our people fall into... What other word is closely connected with the epithet "heroic"? That's right, you can't deceive the tongue - "a heroic dream."

And as you know, "the sleep of reason gives birth to monsters." This is about the fact that a certain mysterious substance — Justice — has been slowly decreasing and melting since 1945. It was not possible to arrange a fair and stable order in the "conquered territories". And who personally formalized this process, "headed" this drift? What milieu brought forth a leader in an era when "the best are lost in the war"?

The answer to this question is at the same time the answer to the main possible reproach: "If you succeed all the time: he is more right, who fought Hitler more, — Then how long will it be? The USSR was the only one to hold the front against Hitler — what, from this it follows that for a third of a century Brezhnev will be the smartest and most right-wing in the world? When do these uncertain post-war years end (and pre-war years begin)?"

Consider this phrase, if you like. prophecy - "In this war we have lost the best. And this will certainly have an effect" — it can take an infinitely long time. You can never think of anything. It seems to me that attempts to interpret it will be more effective - in parallel with the interpretation of "Prophecy No. 2": "Without theory, we will perish."

210 Igor Shumeiko

Here are the circumstances of the pronunciation of this phrase are known more or less accurately. This was said to the newly elected member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU, the philosopher D.I. Chesnokov. Even the isolated facts themselves - the election of the philosopher Chesnokov to the Presidium of the Central Committee (the then temporary equivalent of the expanded Politburo) and Stalin's appeal to him already deserve much more attention. And it is very characteristic that the "perestroika" publicists, who scanned all the compositions of the then elite, along and across, including Shepilov, who had already been tragically beaten a hundred times, "joined them", did not stop looking at this interlocutor of Stalin, Chesnokov. external addressee of those generally strange and mysterious words.

Let me remind you that the case took place in "... the country of the victorious theory (teaching) of Marx", "all-powerful, because true"... etc. It would not be an exaggeration to say that 99.9% of the population were sure that we already had a theory. The absence of many other things was just compensated by the certainty that... And certainly 100% were sure: to doubt that "Marxism is the most comprehensive result of the development of human thought..." is a true "vyshak".

So without what theory will "we" (it is clear that the USSR) "perish"?

A sufficient (maybe already critical) mass of studies and works of serious scientists is already being collected, which will provide one important revolution in the minds of our fellow citizens. Grigory Khanin, in a conversation with Lev Anninsky on the pages of Rodina magazine, reveals some contours of a new look at the history of the country in the second half of the 20th century. This also coincides with the main meaning of the works of the historian Mukhin.

"Stalin's New Program" included:

- 1) detente of international tension; ,
- 2) publicity;
- 3) limited democracy, primarily in zartiya;
- 4) improvement of the life of the population;
- 5) decentralization of the economy.

World War II. Reboot 7

The evidence for this is the most serious. A lot of things do not even need to be revealed - you just need to stop hushing up. Like, for example, the Great Reform Party in the late 1940s. The transport and agricultural departments of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks were liquidated, and the functions of control over sectoral departments were eliminated from the duties of secretaries of the Central Committee. Departments responsible only for the selection of personnel and ideology were left in the apparatus of the Central Committee. The party was removed from the direct management of the economy. (These are all points of the hard struggle "for democratization and Leninist norms in 1989-1991".)

In international life, concessions in Korea, containment of foreign communist parties. The strongest irritant for the West, the Cominform (the successor to the Third International) actually ceases its activities. As soon as the new program of the Communist Party of Great Britain became loyal (peaceful parliamentary path to socialism, preservation of the private sector), it was published in the Bolshevik magazine (1951).

G. Khanin: "Stalin was a pragmatist. He came to the conclusion that due to the successes of the USSR in military technology, the huge expansion of the socialist camp after the victory of the Chinese revolution (1949), the period of survival for our country ended. Further success depended on the ability of the system to promote the initiative and creativity of citizens, which was hindered by the totalitarian system."

The removal of the party nomenklatura layer by Stalin was prepared so far in advance that only today fragments of this plan are being collected and identified. Like encouraging a critical approach in literature. According to Simonov, Stalin especially scolded the "theory of non-conflict", and linked the requirement of "party membership of writers" with the past period of the struggle for power and today declared it invalid.

Well, all the well-known publications of Ovechkin, Vera Panova in Novy Mir and Pravda in 1952 are witnesses

└ Igor Shumeiko

talk about the same thing. The popular expression "we need Gogols. Shchedrin" is from Stalin's speech at the meeting of the Committee for the award of the Stalin Prizes in 1952. Yuri Zhdanov (son, scientist) remembers how, in the summer of 1952, Malenkov conveyed Stalin's order: to liquidate Lysenko's monopoly in biological science, to introduce Lysenko's opponents, primarily Tsitsin and Zhebrak, into the presidium of the All-Russian Academy of Agricultural Sciences.

Kaganovich testifies that at the next (it turns out - XX) congress, Stalin planned to make a serious and self-critical report. Or, frankly speaking, and vice versa, he could have sent the entire staff of the XX Congress (1952) after the KhUP - for him it would have been more a matter of tactics. One thing is indisputable: 20-year-old Brezhnev-type lethargy was not part of his plans. And the landmark "doctors' case", as it eventually went, was the trap of the nomenklatura for Stalin – this is also given strong evidence.

It is interesting how in this study such arguments as Ovechkin's essays and peace talks on Korea, the removal of Ryumin, Chesnokov's Jewish wife and Stalin's consent coexist in this study.

for the unification of Germany. A serious sign of peace for Stalin was the removal in April 1951 of the Commander-in-Chief of the US Forces in the Far East (the main hot spot), General MacArthur, the main supporter of a nuclear war with the USSR.

It is certainly interesting to go further along a fully developed "flow chart", proving that Stalin was preparing a new course, such as Deng Xiaoping, Pinochet, Frank, but still it means moving away from the main topic of this book. Let's leave only the conclusion: Stalin, thinking for a long time about the idea of a post-war organization of life in the USSR and in the resulting huge sphere of influence, he understood that the former state structure and party (created for the seizure of power and survival) are no longer suitable.

World War II. Reboot

1. Russia did not have a positive experience of organizing life in the conquered territories. And Siberia? But in general, "one-sixth"? And this is just an indirect proof of the rightness of the Eurasians. There was no capture, as such (like the Germans - Prussia, the Baltic states), on our "one-sixth". It was, as it is right, it turns out, they write: "entering into the inheritance in the Dzhuchiev Ulus (Volga region, Urals, Siberia)". And, characteristically, it is precisely these acquisitions that ultimately remained.

2. Communism, as an organizational support (through the system of "fraternal parties") and as a unifying idea, might be useful. but in a completely different way.

We can only guess: what contours would our life, our Empire, take, if ... "we did not die without a theory." Before the mind's eye rises like an unknown, undiscovered continent.

In much the same way, Octavian Augustus and other great Iszari charted the Course of World History through completely unexplored lands. Their Empire through the Principate was built very slowly, gradually, preserving the entire republican lexicon.

The title Imperator, which we remember, was one of many, and not the most important. Power gave the title of Princeps of the Senate, personal immunity and the right of veto - the position of tribune (moreover, the original meaning of the tribune position, protection of the plebeians, was simply forgotten, the very line disappeared: patricians / plebeians).

The most important guarantee of the stability of power was membership in priestly colleges (two or three main ones). Marcus Aurelius (famous philosopher and considered the best monarch in the history of mankind) was a Salus (leaper). These priests jumped, repeating phrases whose meaning was lost 800-900 years ago. The haruspices divined from the entrails... But the most famous priestly college was the Augurs. From them came the expression "to look over

Igor Shumeiko

sit and laugh like augurs." It was believed, or rather suspected, that the augurs, among themselves, laugh at their divination. Preserving, however, all forms of reverence for the ancient tradition and interfering with reason: both the labyrinths of myth, and the rational view, and the state need ...

And the Communist Stalin, turning to the Communist Chesnokov: "We need a theory," I also see him as a bit of an augur. Maybe the members of the Politburo would become such augurs, "jumpers" on the Mausoleum, fortune-tellers according to the Sacred Book "Capital". (Adjusted for the acceleration of world history, these would not be Roman centuries, but ours, maybe ... "five-year plans" ...) Marxism, communism would probably take on ritual forms ...

Then here it is, and the main reason <... Stalin's ruthless extermination of revolutionaries, loyal and talented Marxists, loyal and talented Leninists "... and further see the Ogonyok magazine.

There were twelve augurs in Rome, ten haruspices. {Or vice versa.}

But what kind of state could withstand the feeding and ATTEMPTS to "lead" hundreds of thousands of "faithful and talented" (and therefore self-confident) carriers of a non-working theory?! Solid guardians of the unsuccessful ... weather forecast for the day before yesterday ?! Memorized "Capital", the last chapters of which were already being completed by Engels, twisting Marx's theories to fit the realities that had changed over several years. Of course, it would be better if they were ("prominent Marxists"), it would be more rational - in pig farmers, in janitors, in builders, than "against the wall" ... BUT what happened happened, and choose the reason - which one you like best, of two:

1. The terrible cruelty of Stalin:
2. The ambitions of our "prominent Marxists".

The Chinese "prominent Marxists" for the most part nevertheless went to the agricultural commune, "for re-education." Dan

World War II. Reboot

Xiaoping worked (not in a pigsty, though, but in a cowshed), but can you even for a moment imagine Trotsky and others in a cowshed? ...

The line of Khrushchev, Brezhnev, Chernenko that prevailed in the end is simple... There is nothing to compare with... The experimental monkeys scattered around the laboratory, which was left without the Author of the Experiment... They jump, turn some knobs, slap on the buttons remembering the owner...

Andropov alone looked around in surprise: "We do not know the country in which we live! »

The ideological reserve, the "reserve of justice", born of the People's War, quickly dried up. And all the Soviet Union really needed was security. That is why it will be so important to cite the most important, the most fundamental documents of that era. Churchill's "Fulton speech", declaring war on us ("cold"), and Stalin's answers in the Pravda newspaper on March 14, 1946

of the year...

SH AMAZING INQUIRIES

And why is there even a discussion of the "justice" of the war, of the post-war system? Isn't "justice" a meaningless abstract, unscientific epithet (like "beloved", "dear"), inapplicable in such matters?

Nothing can be proved in a hundred lines, one can only point (to) ... That is, again, the most correct answer would be a reference to the leading scientific authorities. If the military, diplomats and lawyers have been using the works of Hugo Grotius for 350 years, right up to their direct inclusion in the texts of international conventions like Geneva, then the following should be briefly said. Hugo Grotius, in his treatise On the Law of War and Peace, introduced definitions (as strict as possible in this area) of Just and Unjust wars. And these

222 Igor Shumeiko

definitions on the basis of the very important concept of "natural law" developed by him. Which, in turn, arose from a very reasonable and fruitful Grotian division of the right into "natural" and "domestic".

"The peculiarity of human nature is a controlled, rational desire for communication, which is the source of natural law. The mother of natural law is the very nature of man. In addition to the natural law, there is a volitional law: the law of peoples and state law ... Further, I will cite only theses from Grotius.

1. The criterion for assessing the justice of war is the observance of natural law. Here is the main idea. It seems to me that the criterion for evaluating wars, the criterion for the fairness of a war, is NOT the law of peoples, NOT the law of the state (since different peoples and states are at war, and everyone has their own state law) ...
2. There is a distinction between justifying (pretexts) and motivating (proper causes) wars. Propositions are always obvious, reasons must be DISCOVERED ...
3. ... "for a defense to be just, it must be necessary."
4. For just public wars, Grotius introduced the definition "Prideful wars. (For definition of public war see Chapter 5).
5. The most interesting particular variant: Grotius brought out cases when the war is fair on both sides. (But this, perhaps, will still be useful, for example, for assessing the First Chechen War ...)
6. There are wars that have arisen for an unjust cause, and wars. into which the vice came from outside and, as a result, also became unjust...

World War II. Reboot

ment to my collection of refutations of Clausewitz, his postulate, actually most harmful for the USSR, about war as a continuation of politics by other means ...)

If the pathos of the first chapters of the book is expressed in the slogan "Adolf Hitler as a trustee of CJSK Europa", then all German apprentices will have their false Certificates of Participation in the Resistance Movement canceled (more precisely, the Largest Certificate raised from the archive is placed on top of the table). , about the Greatest Resistance Movement — German), then these comparisons must be brought to their logical conclusion and admitted: "Yes, in the USSR, the measure of participation in the war was different for different strata."

Let us say at once and frankly: we will deal first of all with one interesting stratum — the "political workers" — and the next (stratum) further stratification. As you know, in 1943, with the abolition of the institution of commissars, the party was finally removed from the direct leadership of hostilities. (And the "exploits" of Commissar Mehlis in the Crimea still deserve a separate perpetuation, maybe someday they will put up a monument, a kind of allegory: "Meanness and stupidity reaching the stars"). And in yet another issue, "education of the masses," the party was, although not removed, but pressed out, sharing this function with the restored Church. And now this strange "last child" remained ... no, the words "zampolit", "political instructor", we still won't pronounce. The "political officer" of a company, battalion is the same soldier, only more courageous and responsible, "Raising to the attack, etc.". The "political officer" of a regiment, division—it happened in different ways. But above - this, as a rule, is the same "happy" category, confirming that you can "get settled" anywhere. "To whom is war, to whom is mother dear." Probably, this is the "law of life": well, for anyone. the most terrible war will find a kind of "bosom". Don't go on the attack

Igor Shumeiko

management does not respond. He delivered the crusts of party cards, put down the third visa on the reward lists (do not forget to insert the last name ... personifying the "role of the party"). And you can sleep happily, probably not even thinking that in the meantime "the world is being won for you"... And while the Mekhlises and Brezhnevs are dozing in the political departments on packs of "Pravda", the steps are being cleared, "the best are dying" .

"There are three oak trees in each unit - political officer, party organizer, club manager" - I still found this saying of Marshal Zhukov. I testify: in 1975-1977 this aphorism was repeated with evil pleasure by

the whole army. But how did the "sheepskin coat" answer Marshal Zhukov (in one anecdote, this was played up: "Lenka's oak")?

Retired, Marshal Zhukov wrote a book. Memories. His truth about the war. I gave the manuscript to the publisher. Years of silence passed. And so. Hang in there waiting, Georgy Konstantinovich Zhukov asks Kosygin to help: "I don't even know where my manuscript is, the last time I sent a letter to Brezhnev. No answer, no hello. Here is the original of that letter:

"Dear Leonid Ilyich!

I turn to you with a request. In 1965 I completed the development of my memoirs, which I had been working on for several years. In the autumn of 1965, I handed over the manuscript to the APN publishing house.

According to reports, the manuscript was transferred to the department of the Central Committee of the CPSU comrade. D.P. Shevlyagin. Much time has passed, and the fate of my manuscript is unknown to me.

I beg you, Leonid Ilyich, to give instructions on the publication of my manuscript. I would very much like to publish a book for the 50th anniversary of the Soviet Army.

Marshal of the Soviet Union Zhukov. || December 1967"

Here is the next letter - to Brezhnev and Kosygin.

World War II. Reboot

"Dear Leonid Ilyich! Alexey Nikolaevich!

A lot of time has passed since the APN prepared the book "Memoirs and Reflections". All comments and wishes of the reviewers have been taken into account.

I know that the department of the Central Committee of the CPSU (comrade Stepanov) also gave its very positive opinion on my manuscript.

I am extremely saddened by the inexplicable delay in the publication of the book. After all, this is the work of my long life.

I beg your intervention.

Sincerely, Marshal of the Soviet Union G. Zhukov. February 23, 1968"

Kosygin promised to help. And, probably, he would have kept his promise, but there was a barrier beyond his control. Mirkina (an employee of a publishing house) spoke about this obstacle:

"Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev wished Marshal Zhukov to mention him in his book. But the trouble is, in all the years of the war they never met on any front. How to be? And then a "way out" was found. Being near Novorossiysk, Marshal Zhukov allegedly went to consult with Colonel Brezhnev, but, unfortunately, he was not there. (Such a solution was invented and formulated in the editorial office). "A smart man will understand," the marshal said with a bitter smile. This absurd phrase appeared in all editions of Memoirs and Reflections, from the first to the sixth inclusive, as well as in foreign editions. Only in the seventh edition was it omitted."

The layout was signed for printing on December 24, 1968. The workers in the printing house were told that the marshal was ill, and it would be good to release the book as soon as possible. One of the printers exclaimed:

226 Igor Shumeiko

Yes, we will work around the clock! Zhukov and I fought against the Nazis, we are ready to work in three shifts even for free:

In March, Mirkina grabbed the first warm copy. got out of the car of the printing house of the Pravda newspaper, and rushed to the dacha to Zhukov. "Georgy Konstantinovich put the book on the table and looked at it silently for a long time ... The marshal worked on its creation for almost ten years. For three years, the finished manuscript lay in the "instances". And so the book was born. It is difficult to convey the feeling of a person who finally holds his book in his hands. To do this, you must be its author. Sometimes the birth of a book is compared to the birth of a child. It seems. This is also a child. It is born in pain and brings great joy, satisfaction and relief."

Zhukov's book was published in 27 countries (by 1988) in 18 languages, millions of copies sold out very quickly. It is not difficult to imagine what a resonance this book caused in the press, what a huge stream of letters poured into Zhukov's address. Georgy Konstantinovich definitely looked younger. The success of the book added a lot of health and vigor. A huge mail with thanks, advice, criticism and wishes prompted the marshal to immediately prepare the second edition.

What can be added here? The only thing is that I have given this fragment not for "malice and slander" for the sake of, but there will be one more twist of the plot, with a reference-mention to Afghanistan and the "dry law". But first, at least a little about... Pyotr Mironovich Masherov.

As they remember today, "next to the sick. As members of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CPSU, weak and falling asleep at important meetings, Masherov looked unforgivably young." And when Brezhnev in 1978, with a major delay, presented him with the Star of the Hero of Socialist Labor, in front of everyone, he rudely interrupted Masherov during his response speech.

World War II. Reboot

And two years later Brezhnev sent to Minsk precisely the secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU Zimyanin, knowing full well how badly he treated Masherov.

Today, historians explain that Leonid Brezhnev was alerted by the following fact. One influential American magazine on the eve of the US presidential election conducted a poll among congressmen. The questions were, among other things: which of the foreign leaders could become the president of the United States, who do they see in Brezhnev's place? And very many in the answers coincided - Masherov. Only a few people in TASS knew about the results of this poll.

When, in July 1980, Masherov's "Chaika" collided with a truck, I remember well how many then repeated: "rigged". But an even greater number of people suddenly realized then (how intuition developed with the then scarcity of information!) that with the death of Pyotr Masherov, the USSR had lost hope for a worthy leader to come, passed another fork, passed another point of possible choice.

Pyotr Masherov was a true hero of the Great Patriotic War, on perhaps the most difficult and dangerous of its "fronts". It is simply impossible to write the history of the partisan movement in Belarus and the Soviet Union without mentioning his name, but he deleted from the texts that were brought to him for approval, most of the countries related to his own exploits, saying: "There is no more about me than about any other Hero of Labor.

Belarus, unlike its current teachers from United Europe-2, not only sacrificed its real estate, undermining all available factories, bridges and roads, but also lost every fourth of its people in that war. On September 9, 1942, the mother of Pyotr Mironovich, Daria Petrovna, died at the hands of the Gestapo.

The well-known saying that "suffering enlightens" is about the same as mentioned a little higher:

238 Igor Shumeiko

People's war brings to life a measure of justice and wisdom, which everyone partakes in proportion to their participation in the suffering and struggle of the people. And as a particular manifestation of this law:

Grain speculators, forgers of ration cards, or ... forgers of marshal's memoirs - these are not the most important participants in the war, and therefore not the best bearers of the justice and wisdom that were discussed.

Philanthropy, Masherov's humanism are his most genuine qualities. In his personal diary, his entry is completely artless: "I love people very much. I admire people. What is most beautiful, what is the strongest, what is our wealth, our achievement, is our people. Their souls respond to all deeds, to all vzgod".

Relatives and friends sometimes wondered why he asked ordinary people with whom he constantly met: "How can I help you? ", but he did not ask his own such questions and treats them stricter than all others. Masherov's sister Olga Mironovna Pronko confessed: "We were afraid to ask him what others asked and received. In order to buy a ticket to Moscow at the Minsk airport, and I really wanted to visit Petya after the operation, for the first and only time in my life I had to take advantage of the fact that I was Petr Mironovich's sister."

An example from the sphere of music may seem frivolous to some, but not the youth of the 70s and 80s. The fact that they found themselves in the "empire of lies" they learned not from Solzhenitsyn, but from a simple comparison of youth songs. "Here" is lies and cynicism in an absolutely unbearable concentration, "there" (in the West) - but in general it is not known what ... set to peppy chords. But the language barrier was also a barrier. The only records that were listened to among the youth were played at dances. there were English-language ensembles and "Song

World War II. Reboot 220

ry". They joked: "Pensnyary" - this is because, it seems, any non-English music is "pensioner's". They joked, but they listened (And now, I know, older ones, they collect all the "laser" reissues of "Tsesnyars", listen to them again with tears and vodka.) uniform lies and cynicism, but "there is Belarus somewhere, something is different there". A guy from the Urals, Mulyavin, arrived, and they "resolved" it. And our "old farts" from the Union of Composers made a decision in the Central Committee: youth ensembles at their concerts should intersperse their songs with THEIR songs. Attached and quotas, royalties, of course. Failure to perform THEIR songs entailed a ban on further concerts, crackdowns, and the police. I assure you that this "decree of the Central Committee" was the most famous of all the Central Committee decisions for a very large part of our population...

I, who conducted a journalistic investigation on the subject of the "prohibition of 1985", had a chance to find out that, it turns out, "Gorbachev was against it." And then that "Ryzhkov was against it." Further, which is characteristic, "Ligachev was also against it." And then it prevented me from working, everything was distracted by some kind of gibberish, half-feeling: "Where did I read about this?" ... And not immediately, but I remembered where this feeling of "déjà vu" came from ... I read this vel about another investigation - according to the Afghan decision. There, in the same way, it turned out that "the KGB was against", "the Ministry of Defense was against", "the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was very against", "Leonid Ilyich was against", "the General Staff was completely against", "...our department The Central Committee was...", "the GRU was resolutely against it". And all the veterans of the relevant departments cited quite specific confirmations, analytical notes, and reports. (Clouds of suspicion were gathering, it seems, over DOSAAF and over the All-Union Society "Knowledge" - according to NIM, there seemed to be no "Teleinvestigations" with rebuttals.) Although it was more likely not one television program or an investigative article, but several different ones,

230 Igor Shumeiko

performed in different years by various TV presenters, writers. And this alone figured out. that "the KGB and the Ministry of Defense were against it." And others - that "the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the General Staff"... But according to the laws of background perception, these private television investigations somehow merged into one. One and the impression of all those years of the country slipping into insanity and non-existence. Possibly, the country had one itans: what people. who saved the country from the most terrible threat in world history, people who continued

"feel" the country, they will try to return common sense to it. And these, who squandered, slipped through even the people's war without contact (Chernenko "raised his party level" in the courses for all four years) - after all, they definitely won't even try ... Perhaps Stalin is right. that we have lost some, perhaps critical, number of "the best", and "it has affected", but even one former partisan Masherov, if he were in power, could make the right decision, for example, on Afghanistan.. .

Bismarck, who led his state through three wars, in 1878 formulated the philosophy of the newly created empire ("Second Reich") as follows: "We want to achieve a state of affairs in which no one would have the right to say: I exist in order to to bear the burden of state hardships, and no one wants to take care of my fate".

In what ways were Bismarck's difficulties similar to Stalin's in 1945? The same huge expansion of the "zone of responsibility". The Second Reich was twice the size of Prussia. Many Germans, especially southern Germans, Swabians, Bavarians, considered themselves by no means "united", but captured.

Bismarck, who passed the well-known "anti-socialist laws" through the Reichstag, threw out the Marxists who were trying to fit into the idea of a just state, BUT not the idea itself. Bismarck's idea of the device of life,

World War II. Reboot 251

after a decade of hard wars, is not based on Marx. some spirit of justice, as if coming out of the barracks. That is why it is characteristic who the "Iron Chancellor" referred to in that keynote speech of 1878.

"Our (Prussian) dynasty has always striven for this goal. Frederick the Great already characterized his mission by saying: I am the king of the poor! Gentlemen, the kings of Prussia have never been kings of the rich. Frederick the Great said: "When I am king, I will be the real king of the poor!" »

It was Frederick the Great, who stood alone against all of Europe in the Seven Years' War... This (I will be the real king of the poor!), Probably, is the true view of the general, who understands that the officer is a means, and the soldier is the goal.

Chapter 17 Facts and Theories

It so happened that the author of this book found the 60th anniversary of the Victory in Germany, in Augsburg. That year, 2005, I was connected with Germany by some journalistic topics. Under the heading "Capitals of the World" of the magazine "My Moscow", an article about Berlin was published, something like road observations, plus "reflections by the roadside", "modernity and history" ... in general, a well-known genre. And the article in Novaya Nedelya magazine (in March 2005) was already much closer to the topics of this book. And although its title - "Adolf Hitler as a trustee of CJSC "Europe" - the editor did not miss, I was still very grateful to him. It is clear that the name of the Fuhrer, which is (in any context) in the title of an article in a Russian magazine, is somehow annoying. Changed. There were no other cuts, distortions, anything that the author could complain about. Moreover, an interesting "feedback" was formed: the editor kept me informed of calls from various individuals and organizations "regarding the material presented about the war." By the way, even the alternative title of that article, which eventually went to print - "Who will be invited to the 100th anniversary of the victory" - could not be called so meaningless, as it is sometimes explained, "the result of a concession, a consequence of the pressure of censorship, self-censorship" . If the first option is a slogan, a direct reproach to Europe, no

World War II. Reboot 243

handing over its military and economic potential to Hitler and thereby immeasurably complicating the Soviet Union's task of liberating itself, then option No. 2 is reflection: how ours and

European assessments of the same event, the Second World War, have changed (and how they will probably change) from anniversary to anniversary.

The starting point of the pamphlet was a certain, if you think about it, paradox - the French did not invite Russia to the 40th anniversary of the opening of the Second Front in 1994 (under Yeltsin) and the invitation - to the 50th anniversary (under Putin)...

It seems that historians have not discovered any new facts, details of the War over this decade, it seems that all the numbers of specific contributions of the Allies, the distribution of German forces between the fronts and the losses suffered have long been known. That relations are only the result of "naked current politics"? As I wrote then, "... and at \$100 per barrel, the French will invite Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates to the "parade of their liberators" as well?". Or is Clio herself, History, involved in these metamorphoses? Have new facts come to light? New theories, new interpretation concepts were born?

I remember very much, even from Soviet times, such a case. One researcher worked for a long time in some provincial archives and as a result found a previously unknown letter from V.I. Lenin. Script. Actually, it was a note with the following content: "Order. To a comrade such and such, who is leaving for Arkhangelsk on a responsible mission, to urgently issue a pair of felt boots and a sheepskin coat. Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars. Signature". All examinations confirmed: everything is absolutely true. written by Lenin. Personally. The article by the author of the discovery (how he worked, "how he believed and searched") was imprinted very approximately. But the meaning and spirit of the framing articles in the same issue of the journal and comments and "responses to the event" in other publications of that period were forever remembered.

254 Igor Shumeiko

Firstly. Good, kind envy to the happy author of the find. "The dissertation, consider it in your pocket!"

Secondly. Wishes and parting words to the entire community. Like: "We must not sit back, "do not wipe our pants" in institutes, but work more boldly and persistently in the archives, in the provinces, meet people...", "After all, this is the only way to discover something really new" .

Third. General professional joy: "Thanks to our work, the work of historians, the following "Complete Works of V.I. Lenin" will be released on 2-3 pages (this is a found note with all the necessary comments and notes) more completely.

And indeed, these were not empty compliments to the "author of a serious contribution." Indeed, in previous editions of the Complete Collected Works ... there were, if not volumes, then certainly hundreds of pages of letters-notes, against which "ours" looked no paler.

The topics of future dissertations, built around the find, looked through without any exaggeration. Or: "new about attention to personnel, about caring for people" (felt boots and a sheepskin coat), or "new about Lenin's attention to the problems of the North" ("a responsible assignment" was to Arkhangelsk). Plus, of course, a monograph with a biography of that very "dressed-shod" comrade.

But most importantly, the whole point was in this, obtained by honest labor, the right to "New in ...".

Maybe since then my hearing has developed in this way, a certain special sensitivity, but only I constantly catch this general tone in any assessment. As if they are asking: "Well, what's new?", "Did you open something or are you shoveling the old one?"

What will you answer here? Relatively new, unfamiliar characters, you recognize, perhaps, only a group of historians involved in criticizing Clausewin (in the corresponding chapter).

Europe" — it already reflects a reality known to many. The proposed terms "Great War", "Great War Law" would be new, but it will still take a huge amount of work, incomparable to the work done, for these semi-intuitive definitions to become recognized terms.

The rest of this book is based on long-known facts, words and deeds of familiar, in general, historical persons. Chamberlain, Hitler, Churchill, Clausewitz, Hugo Grotius... The only fruitful efforts here will be only attempts at composing new combinations of facts. Whether or not at least an emotionally new perception is achieved, please judge by the following etude.

Columns of numbers and columns of tanks

Here are three rather well-known, but isolated, perceived facts.

Fact 1. Anschluss of Austria according to eyewitness accounts (and some of its logistical details).

The triumphal entry into Vienna was the dream of an Austrian corporal. On the night of Saturday, March 12, the Nazi Party intended to arrange a torchlight procession in honor of the victorious hero...

The reasons for this disruption did not become known soon. The German war machine, with difficulty passing through the border. stuck at Linz. Despite excellent weather and good conditions, most of the tanks failed. Defects were found in heavy motorized artillery. The road from Linz to Vienna was jammed with stopped cars. Responsibility for the deadlock, which showed that at this stage of its recovery, the German army is by no means in full

Igor Shumeiko

readiness, was entrusted to Hitler's favorite, General von Reichenau. Hitler himself saw this traffic jam, driving a car through Lini, and became furious. Light tanks randomly entered Vienna on Sunday. Armored vehicles and heavy motorized guns were loaded onto railway platforms and that was the only reason they made it in time for the ceremony. The Fuehrer was furious at the obvious shortcomings of his military machine and attacked his generals, but they did not remain in debt. They reminded him of his unwillingness to listen to Fritsch, to take heed of the warning. that Germany is not ready for a big conflict ...

Fact 2. The balance of forces in 1938 (Czechoslovakia - 469 tanks, 2 million people, Germany - 720 tanks, 2.2 million people) in comparison with the picture of the Anschluss of Austria - with the above picture of the scattering of German scrap metal on the Linz-Vienna road . Apparently, these facts lie on different historical shelves: this is called the "Anschluss of Austria". And that is completely different - in our history it goes under the column "Sudet", "Hitler's threat", "Munich".

But between these "cases on different shelves" there is a distance of 2-3 weeks! And today, recalling this Munich shyness, one must definitely remember that the German tanks counted by the Anglo-French-Czech Genitabists are the very ... products that. it turns out, it was necessary to transport by rail. Moving under their own power along the highway is a maneuver inaccessible to them. What about cross country? And in the Sudeten (Giant) mountains? And what about the fortified frontiers on these mountains?.. But even the fact that the Sudetes were turned into the most powerful fortification in Europe is, of course, mentioned, but in special works. It is somehow forgotten that the Sudetes are not only the place of residence of the corresponding Germans, but also the mountains themselves, and that the combination of mountainous relief and fortification gives

World War II. Reboot

effect, incomparable with all sorts of "information promoted" lines. Maginot, Siegfried...

So, we mentioned the German tanks of 1938. And what about the opposite statistical column of numbers - Czech tanks? And this is

Fact 3. Here you have to climb on a completely different shelf to find out about the European leadership of Czechoslovakia in the export of military equipment in 1938. The same Churchill keeps repeating: "Skoda factories! Skoda factories! More powerful than all the British ones." In addition to Skoda, there were also factories – ChKD-Prague, whose TMNR-5 tank was successfully exported to Iran, Sweden, Switzerland, and Romania in the 1930s.

And I, as a person who had the opportunity to work for eight years in the Foreign Trade, can testify: it is simply impossible for these countries (Sweden, Switzerland, for example) to sell something similar to the then German junk. Their own, local industrialists will conduct such a "PR campaign" that just hold on ... For example, in 1938 the Dutch government decided to buy the British Nietbeg light armored car (or a license for its production). The Van Doorne industrialists, who at that time had no analogue in the project, found out about these intentions ... They connected, connected the public, authorities ... As a result, the armored car was designed, and then began to be produced on their, pre-ornevskoy, firm PAP And since we took this example, you need to trace its path to the end. (Moreover, the "ends" of the then European military equipment are so symptomatically similar.) The M-39 RAE armored car turned out to be an excellent car, but, fortunately for us, only 25 units managed to produce it. Why "for our luck"? Yes, that's why! The strength of the Dutch military resistance would not have been affected by the fact that they even had ... 2500 tanks, and so ... Fortunately, only

235 Igor Shumeiko

25 tanks, they went to the Germans (intact, of course) and were shot down, as indicated on one report with photographs, somewhere near Leningrad...

And the German "armored mosh" of 1938 is another historical aberration. All these terrible "tigers", "panthers", "Ferdinands" - all this appeared only on Russian fields. And you, gentlemen, the Fuhrer, it turns out, frightened you with the roar of his falling apart homemade products.

If after this study your assessment of "Munich" ("Munich", which kept Hitler in power and gave him other tanks, under which other people had to throw grenades), if at least your emotional perception of that collusion has changed even a little, means that the "method" works.

Why is this gathering of "threads" in a book about the war? That's right, about the war... When you reconsider all these "threads", or rather, a solid fabric that has been developed over the centuries... Then, in general, the look at this war becomes even more tragic. You will remember not only that Book of Russian Knights of St. George (there are more than a third of Karl-Ivanychi and Petr-Friedrichovich), but also the Great Catherine Tsvaitishe (Second). And also the Hessian princess Ella, the most beautiful bride in Europe, who refused the future Kaiser Wilhelm, who was engaged in marriage, married the Grand Duke Sergei Alexandrovich, became a widow after the Kalyaev explosion, founded the Martha Mary Convent and chose the fate of a Russian great martyr and saint. Remember, And then the question "Why?" (about the war) - lights up like a biblical inscription on the wall.

And the notorious topic of "comparing the living standards in the Victorious country and the Defeated country" becomes, against the background of this question, completely insignificant ...

But if we touch on this unfortunate stamp (along the LINE of "comparison of living standards ...", or with elements of it, almost all West German

World War II. Reboot 239

reports), then we can say ... What are the levels ?! Levels are leveling out... In Germany, it's been five years since the economic crisis, in our country it's the other way around. Gap, if we are talking about "expressed in numbers",

objectively shrinking...

But those of our journalists who for thirty years "strangled themselves" to break out "foreigners in the FRG", write dramatic "essays about the unemployed" ... and those people who, during perestroika, came up with those same jokes about our veteran ("I didn't have to win - I would drink Bavarian beer now") - these are all equally nice people ...

Moreover. I think they are actually, physically, the same people. This is such a terrible guess.

Chapter 18 Problems of the RK department of the corporation. "Russian Federation"

No, of course, the author does not pretend to be a general analysis — from the sea of our current propaganda problems, we will draw out only those related to the Second World War and its geopolitical consequences. However, we will immediately see how many more acutely modern political issues will follow.

As an example of the need to work with the PK factor, in Chapter 9 I cite the following Paradox.

Countless times it is described how after the defeat of Poland by Germany on September 17, "<... Soviet troops crossed the unprotected eastern (Polish) border". Do you notice how touching it sounds: "unprotected" on a romantic or everyday level?! As if an additional condemnation of the one who crossed the unprotected border. Demagogues, historians of the level of the Ogonyok magazine, in their "historical critical" researches, repeated this a thousand times. "Fixed" – here we have found one more point of accusation: "...unprotected". In the world of real politics, exactly the opposite is true! Protected - means that no Polish troops were drawn to it. This means that the USSR did not actually influence the course (and outcome) of the two-week Polish-German war!

World War II. Reboot 241

So, here is the job for the "RK department of the corporation "Russian Federation"" – to ensure the widest possible distribution of the corresponding "Lress release on the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact". Where to explain the then harsh realities, and where to indicate the place: Those who left the war cannot dictate the rules of war.

Now for the next example of an important direction of the "RE-department of our corporation." So given:

Enormous efforts of European and American propaganda, from the latest newspaper to Hollywood and a huge number of books, were aimed at establishing in the public consciousness the postulates: "Hitler is a mystic, Satanist, occultist. The NSDAP is a God-fighting, anti-Christian party. The Third Reich is generally a mystical order. Ahnenerbe, Tibet, Thule, Shambhala, etc."

It is required to show that the absolutization of these postulates can bring real harm to the country that defeated the Third Reich, Russia.

Here, to begin with, a long historical digression is required.

In Europe at the turn of the 17th and 18th centuries, after all the victories of the great scientific revolution, a significant part of the French elite suddenly began to incline to the idea that "Louis the Fourteenth is still in some way God." After Pascal and Descartes, in the time of Newton and Leibniz, the French aristocrats, who were traditionally friends and patrons of scientists, suddenly wanted to become like the ancient Egyptian peasants who prayed to their pharaohs (the closest historical analogue).

So, Historians with knowledge of psychology found the origins of this unconditional phenomenon in... defeated, broken Fronlde.

The spirit, the way of thinking of the French aristocrat was formed in the estate monarchy and was vitally connected with the whole

2.42 Igor Shumeiko

universe of various privileges, "feudal-knightly habits". They "fronted" for their own "habits" to preserve. And complete defeat. "breaking through the knee" seriously threatened class honor, morality and even the mental health of an aristocrat. So the following thought slowly condensed: "It's possible to humiliate yourself in front of Ludovik, it's not shameful, because it is ... then, sir ... in some way - God."

And what were the two hundred and fifty million Europeans to do? (The human potential of the Third Reich. Hitler especially loved and very often repeated this, in general, correctly guessed, the number of his subjects.) What should the 250 million respectable Christians liberated by the Red Army, the Soviet Union, do? Moreover, when did a whole set of economic claims against the former liberator mature?

That's right, the key to self-rehabilitation is the maximum (pre)multiplication of the power of fascism by the demonic multiplier. This allows:

1. Reduce the measure of responsibility for capitulation and for the five- (sometimes six-) years of maintenance of the Nazi machine: "Hitler? - He was strong. devil! They didn't cope."
2. Get a "clean slate", carte blanche for modern political maneuvers. The clearest example is the 1999 attack on Yugoslavia. The United Europe-2, which brought it to fruition, geographically, ethnically, physically repeated the United Europe-1, except that the capital moved from Berlin to Brussels. And even concern for the interests of the minority (Kosovo Albanians) was surprisingly reminiscent of Adolf's touching concern for the Sudeten Germans.

And guided today by Clause 2, European politicians would respond to a possible Serbian accusation against the United Europe-2 in the following way:

"And that time, in 1941, it was not us who attacked. Not Europe. Go is in the physiological sense, they were, of course, yes - our fathers and grandfathers. But then Satan himself was at the head. Beelzebub,

World War II. Reboot 243

Asmodeus... and Lucifer. From him and all the demand. And now our bombings and trampling of your Yugoslav state sovereignty are based on very, very different ideals. On downright ideal ideals."

Therefore, all, all the slightest facts of similarity, continuity of Europe-194[and Europe-2006 (7,8) should be constantly highlighted by this hypothetical RK department of the RF corporation, become the same subject of discussions, books, articles, films, as "human rights". "minority rights", "democratic values" and other similar topics where we are played traditionally and masterfully. A recent (at the time of this writing) example: Russia tried to raise the price of gas to Ukraine (from a quarter of the world market price to a half) and became an "energy blackmailer", "strangler of the orange democratic revolution".

And after all, our Supreme Commander-in-Chief also set an example of state management of the RV-company in his time. In 1941-1944, when European-backed Germans burned and killed on the territory of the Soviet Union, the well-known slogans of our propaganda were: "Kill the German! ", "Death to the fascist invaders! And in 1945, exactly on the eve of the first meeting of our troops with the civilian population of Germany, I.V. Stalin came out with a special, famous article. "Comrade Ehrenburg is mistaken. Hitlers come and go, but the German people remain." The fascists for us, in fact, have already ceased to be "occupiers" ("occupy" is translated as "occupy"). and then we had to free Europe from... its First Unifier...

And in 1999, the same French who invaded as part of NATO troops were supposed to wait in Belgrade for a slogan reminding how the Germans who attacked Yugoslavia in 1941 were literally fattened by the one who surrendered a year before

Igor Shumeiko

this France. A reminder of those same annual French reparations deliveries: 750,000 tons of wheat, 140,000 tons of meat, 650 million liters of milk, 220 million liters of wine. This is not counting the mountains of military and other equipment, plus the dispatch of 50,000 French workers every month to free the Germans going to the Wehrmacht. This is not counting the thousands of businesses involved in the Speer program (see Chapters 9-10).

After all, both fascist tank builders (Czechs) and fascist breadwinners (French, Dutch, Belgians, Danes) owe, still owe not only Russia, but also Serbia, which continued the war with Hitler for four years.

About the resistance scale

Another example of absolutely necessary RK-maneuverability. If during the war our newspapers even mentioned the fact of "the heroic French resistance movement—the strike of the French miners," then today it is time to say that a strike is an effective means only against the backdrop of productive work. Even young people, immigrants and French citizens burning cars, simply could not threaten to strike, because they were much less integrated into the economic mechanism than the Europeans of the 1940s were under Hitler.

We must remind you that on the "resistance scale", car arson and street riots are much, much higher than a strike...

Let's back up our arguments with good shots. Illustration: some trade union bosses in a meeting room, at the same table with the owners (without a signature and you can't understand who is who), cups of coffee. spread out papers, polite smiles...

This is an exemplary answer to the European parliamentarians who cover the SS parades in Riga and demand

World War II. Reboot 245

we hold gay pride parades in Moscow, and in the absence of them, that is, "in the absence of democracy in Moscow", challenging Russia's right even to its energy resources.

So what about Hitler's Satanism? Or does the author call for the sake of the current propaganda usefulness to forget about the essence of the issue?

Generally speaking, the literature about the "mystical, satanic Reich" is a sea-ocean. The only difference is: the Ocean, the Level of the Ocean is stable, even accepted as a known reference point. Literature about the "Tula-Shambala Nazis" grows almost weekly. "Secrets of the Reich, SS, Himmler-Bormann" - a commodity? "Occultism, mysticism, spiritualists, magicians" - a commodity?

So... "Magicians in the SS, Mysticism of the Third Reich" will be - super goods!

For all this pop, an old, enviable landmark, an example of hitting the bestsellers was, of course, the book published in 1960 by Louis Povel and Jacques Bergier - "Morning of the Magicians". With their light hand, Povel-Bergier, even the learned geopolitician Karl Haushofer, who really had an influence on Hitler during his imprisonment in the Landsberg fortress, is appointed to the magicians (and the influence becomes, accordingly, magical), something like... the Wizard of Oz. They, Povel-Bergier, also gave a formula, a definition-explanation of Hitler's strength: "Rene Guenon plus tank divisions." Well, René Guenon is an "authoritative magician", a brand in the occult

world, and the slogan itself, in general. came out lucid and biting, like an advertising slogan, something like ...
"Just add water! »

So. The vein was opened. And then happily and ... it seems, it is not by chance that the financial attractiveness of such writings and a certain off-screen political order were combined: to bring Adolf out. Himmler. Rosenberg and others outside the brackets of European politics. position them as "half-educated magicians" (remember, there was such a song).

Igor Shumeiko

As a navigator in this "magical" ocean, we will involve Dmitry Zhukov, the author of an excellent study "Occultism in the Third Reich". Although. Honestly. he had some kind of work ahead of him... sewage work. What is it like to reread dozens of graphomaniacs copying each other in circles: the Templars — the Grail — the Cathars — the riddle of the pyramids — Loch Ness — Shambhala — Thule — ... (further with all the stops).

Well, let's use the results of Zhukov's work.

In the "Morning of the Magi", it turns out that the following is also written:

"February 23, 1957, in Bohemia, a diver was looking for the body of a student who had drowned in Devil's Lake. He (the diver) swam to the surface with a face pale with horror, unable to utter a word. When the gift of speech returned to him, he reported that he saw under the cold heavy waters of the lake a ghostly line of German soldiers in uniform, a convoy of harnessed carts. As the youth would say: "Oh! Underwater zombies are cool! »

And then D.Kh. Brennan, The Black Magic of Adolf Hitler.

Chapter Titles: Black Initiate, Roots of Evil, Evil Symbol, Sacrifice
Satan."

"... Hitler decided on a treaty. He decided to ask Satan for help, to ask for a miracle of such power that could change external physical conditions ... We studied his (Hitler's) career - it is the career of a magician. In short, the way Hitler thought and acted — this is exactly how Satanists live, think and act... The witches carried out special actions to prevent Hitler from landing after the fall of France..."

Goodrick-Clark, The Occult Roots of Nazism. Jean Robin, Hitler, Chosen of the Dragon. It is here that Haushofer is appointed as a magician, a teacher. So to speak. "chief magician".

Reasons? On instructions from the Bavarian General Staff, Haushofer traveled to Japan, and Tibet is nearby! He must have visited!.. Nua, who has visited Tibet, is a magician with no options:...

World War II. Reboot 247

Next is Trevor Ravenscroft, Spear of Destiny. (The spear of the Roman warrior Longinus is from the same nomenclature as the Grail.) Here Hitler joins the ranks of the famous: Aleister Crowley (Satanist). Rudolf Steiner and... Helena Blavatsky.

Yes, yes, and Nana's compatriot (by the way, Count Witte's cousin), Helena Blavatsky, the founder of Theosophy, is a bright, first-rate brand in the occult market. More often than others in the 19th / 20th century, she used the swastika sign in books and letters. It is believed that it was she, "her swastika", who influenced Adolf when choosing a "label" for "his company".

I repeat once again: the mention of individual books is FROM the "elohi of the initial accumulation of magical capital". When the names of the authors were still distinguishable. This was followed by a real shaft, hundreds of books and brochures, voices became indistinguishable, and ... the magician-Hitler became a fact of public consciousness.

And now Yuri Vorobyevsky releases "Ahnenerbe - the occult sword of the Reich."

N. Nepomniachtchi - "Secrets of the Occult Reich". S. Zubkov - "The Occult Magic of the Third Reich". And a certain Anton Pervushin - "Occult secrets of the NKVD and the SS. Here is a good example of a book where everything is clear already from the title. All the same historical and mystical pop. However, Dmitry Zhukov (professional duty!) plunges into this ist-mist Dontsova, where; "the secrets of the Merovingian family, the Templars and Dominicans, the secret gift of some Odoacer, and, well, the famous Satanist Aleister Crowley, whose entire connection with fascism was that he was thrown out of Italy in 1923 by order of Mussolini."

I would still single out this one from the general commercial stream, Pervushin's - "The Occult Secrets of the NKVD and the SS." The example is typical. Say, magic, "... the boundaries of the real, material world are so unsteady, conditional...", and now the NKVD falls into the same niche, into the same "segment" with the SS. And there, you see, there will appear ... "The magic of the Red Army and the Wehrmacht" ...

Igor Shumeiko

That's a good topic for a hypothetical (so far) press conference. Agenda items:

1. Who benefits from the positioning of Hitler as a kind of Harry Potter today (only enraged and falling into a "denial")?
2. About the primary sources used for this positioning.

It seems to be at the everyday level: attaching additional negative characteristics to the enemy is, as it were, a kind of ... contribution to the "propaganda fight against the common enemy".

This premise is not entirely correct. And even completely wrong, if applied without taking into account the historical phase, the period of application. In the "Battle Sheet", before the attack? Or during a period of calm discussions, when one deliberately false accusation can undermine the credibility of ten real accusations?

But here it is better to start with Point 2. About primary sources.

It is clear that today about the "Occult secrets of the NKVD and SS" people are being sold for sale, who in their life have not even crossed the threshold of archives, in principle, they don't even know where these archives are located in their countries. Books multiply by cell division, like bacteria in rancid broth, but... the question of the primary source for a serious researcher remains relevant.

We continue, relying on the work of Dmitry Zhukov, who discovered the primary source of the occult pops.

"Mobilization" by Hermann Rauschning is a vivid example of the operation of the laws of propaganda warfare. So. Hermann Rauschning was born in 1887 in Thorn. Adventurer by nature. His military career practically fell apart: by 1918 he was only a lieutenant. After the war, he settled in Danzig, heading the German Cultural Society. In 1932, he joined the Nazis, for a short time he became the chairman of the Danzig Senate, in which capacity he had an audience with Hitler 4 (four) times. Quarreled with Gauleiter Forster, expelled from the SS, NSDAP, emigrated to Switzerland.

World War II. Reboot

In the summer of 1939, in dire need of money, Rauschning accepted an offer from anti-fascist activist Imre Reves to write, in record time, disguised as a memoir, a propaganda book exposing Nazism. The Jewish writer Reves at that time led the anti-German propaganda in the world press, in contact with Churchill and the war party in London. Possessing almost unlimited resources, Reves provided a large staff of his employees, translators, to help Rauschning. As a result, almost instantly (according to publishing

standards) published the book "Hitler told me. Confidential reports of the Fuhrer about his plans for conquering the whole world" (1939).

The book was immediately published in 20 countries in huge circulation. In it, for the first time, it was mentioned that the Nazis had a certain "secret teaching, developed in certain circles of a very small elite." To which (elite) Rauschning himself was necessarily assigned. And 4 (four) of his audiences with the Fuhrer, respectively, were turned into "hundreds of frank conversations."

Rauschning's further "discography": "Revolution of Nihilism" (1939), "Voice of Destruction" (1940), "Beast from the Abyss" (1940), "Time of Frenzy" (1946).

Chapter 4 of his first "hit" in 1939 was called "The Anti-Christian" - and it became the source of THOUSANDS of "research" books and pamphlets, feeding the Pervushins and Vorobyovs to this day.

Chapter "Black and White Magic": "Hitler gave himself up to the forces that draw him along ... He has long surrendered to the power of witchcraft, which, not without reason and not at all in a figurative sense, can be called demonic magic."

The Fuhrer and Freemasons: "They form something like an elite of the clergy ... they fence themselves off from people with the help of symbols and rituals. Hierarchical structure and upbringing with symbols, apart from reason, by fertilization of fantasy, magical influence... – and this I adopt from them."

250 Igor Shumeiko

He is also a COMMUNIST: "There are more similarities between us and the Bolsheviks than differences. First of all, a true revolutionary spirit, free from the intrigues of any nparhat Social-Democracy..."

All this (to Raushning Reves) reminds me a bit of a scene from Dead Souls, where provincial officials, stupefied with boredom, interrogate the "witness Nozdryov":

"What, maybe Chichikov and ... Napoleon ?!

— Nanoleon. Napoleon. No Doubt - Napoleon

Even many years later, in the famous film "Ordinary Fascism" by Mikhail Romm, it turns out that Rauschning's phrases are reproduced:

"I," said Hitler, "liberate people from the burdensome limitations of the mind, dirty and degrading self-poisoning by chimeras called conscience and righteousness."

However. There is one important difference between Rauschning's discoveries and Nozdrev's: there was a war going on at that time. And Reves fulfilled (and, one might say, brilliantly fulfilled) his duty as a publicist.

But, probably, even the most talented publicists need the state redirection of their excitement and efforts (I almost made a reservation - "barking"). So Stalin in 1945 "corrected" Ehrenburg, but there was practically no one to correct Mikhail Romm in the 1960s. And even more so, no one will correct the "publicists" of the early 2000s who take the layman along the route "Reich Chancellery – Thule – Shambhala".

What could be more serious than World War II, Munich, Yalta? And here you are (the place has been cleared) – the rights of minorities, the Strasbourg European gatherings, the Helsinki groups...

From the point of view of the laws of the media and PR, these are all competing topics.

And today, for example, such a logical chain:

World War II. Reboot

- Is a gay parade banned in Moscow?
- There is no democracy in Russia!
- So, Russia has no right to sell its resources at world prices! (And attempts to get closer to world prices are "energy blackmail"!)
- this has already been quite successfully introduced into the public consciousness.

And another logical chain (the main one in this book) - about: the continuing responsibility of the United Europe-2 (Brussels) - for the acts of the United Eurona-1 (Berlin) during the Second World War - it is precisely this that is obscured by the first (Let's call it glamor and politically correct) in the struggle for print space, for air minutes.

And anyone trying to draw public attention to the topic of Europe's real, geopolitical responsibility will stumble upon the same, the "pops" perception of the War.

What kind of war? Is this where they rescued "Private Ryan" and Schindler rode around the camps with his "List"? But these films are still all right. The truth about the Great War still emerges there. But the transformation of the Second World War into a competition of magicians, table-rotators, this is Bolytsa Undermining.

Even the propaganda canard with equating the battle of El Alamein with the Battle of Stalingrad, and then, as they say, is "available for processing." With the help of numbers and four arithmetic operations on them, you can restore the truth. But it will be much more difficult to fight this global dispersion of historical attention, Memory, washing out the very idea of War. "Magic", "occult services" - this is a familiar page in all current advertising newspapers. The strong entry of the Fuhrer, the NSDAP, the SS there - this would be the most negative outcome. complete loss of the RK campaign.

If the director of a bank went mad, became a clown, fled to Brazil, which of the clients would suffer the most? Probably in proportion to contributions.

252 | Igor Shumeiko

And if Hitler suddenly turns out to be Harry Potter - whose History will suffer more: Denmark, with its one and a half hour paramilitary resistance in 1940, or ...

Swastika - Cross

The next important topic is Fascism and Religion. And here the overlaps are just as harmful. Let's show Hitler. if it didn't work out as a Satanist, then by Satan himself! Enemy of Christianity. And Hitler was a politician, a European politician. As they say, "they don't beat the wolf for being gray." The Fuhrer can rather be accused of religious indifference, of a purely utilitarian attitude towards religion. Need to strengthen the loyalty of nearby employees? And Hitler agrees to be the godfather of their children.

Raise the birth rate in the Reich? And Hitler announces: "I will personally be the godfather of the tenth child of every German mother." And he was an invariable diligent participant in the sacrament of baptism. Or, let's say, they tried to split the population of the Soviet Union, and in the occupied territories it was opened: in the regions of the RSFSR - 2150 churches, in Belarus - 600 churches, in Ukraine - 5400.

Politician Hitler most of all feared a violation of the unity of the German nation. He overcame the threat of disunity on property, social grounds by the most active political measures (a blow to the communists, the elimination of unemployment, a system of restrictions for big capital -

these are his measures, of course. topic of separate books, it is enough to state that some of his social decisions and ideas are still in circulation). But the threat of religious intra-German conflicts, Hitler tried to eliminate in the bud, extremely restrained. cautious, "equidistant" policy.

World War II. Reboot

In Mein Kampf he writes that the initiators of religious strife are "much worse enemies of the people, even than who tears the faith of another. Only with mutual compliance, only with equal tolerance can the present state of affairs be corrected and ensure that in the future the nation really becomes united and great.

So far, these are Hitler's intentions, personal convictions. Before turning to his real politics after 1933, let us briefly mention the religious ideas of his environment.

Goebbels was born into a Catholic family, he dreamed of priesthood. Both in his autobiographical novel "Michael" and in his diary, he repeated: "Our struggle is in the deepest sense the struggle between the teachings of Christ and Marx."

Rosenberg. His book "The Myth of the 20th Century" also received a detailed review from our Sergiy Bulgakov, who noted its "... literary brilliance and sharpness." Rosenberg rejects the Old Testament and the Apostle Paul.

We can also mention the rather boring bickering that accused Rosenberg of "neopaganism", "Wotanism" and justifications for the fact that Dde "described Wotanism as a dead religion". Rosenberg's main political point is: "The National Socialist movement does not need religious dogma either in defense of religion or in the fight against it... my ideological recognition is considered only as my personal one..."

These excerpts may recall one well-known and. in my opinion, partly a mocking religious statement of an all-German idol. military genius, King Frederick the Great: "In my kingdom, everyone is saved as he wants!" (He meant "salvation of the soul." belonging to any religion.)

Igor Shumeiko

Himmler. Also from a Catholic family, plus his father was the tutor of the Crown Prince of Bavaria, Heinrich. (Prince Heinrich, by the way, was also the godfather of the future Reichsführer SS.) The text of the SS oath was downloaded "... And God help me." He instructed the professorial staff of the SS officer schools: "I categorically forbid you to show not only tactlessness, but even inattention to representatives of all confessions without exception ... If I demand from the SS men that they be believers ... then I demand it quite intelligently and firmly. People who do not recognize a higher being or predestination — I will not tolerate in my environment. Any attack on Christ as a person is absolutely unacceptable."

To this person — Christ — they, the Nazis, willingly "issued" the most valuable document in the Reich — "Certificate of non-Jewish origin", "Certificate of Aryanness"...

Only Bormann can be considered a more or less convinced fighter against Christian denominations. In the questionnaire of a Bundestag deputy in 1933, he called himself a Protestant, but already in 1936 he officially announced his withdrawal, together with his wife, from the list of parishioners. The underlying causes of this change are not yet known to historians—except, of course, for the above-mentioned commercial occult writers (everything is clear there: a flying saucer - Tibet - an appeal - a bloody oath to overshamanize Christians ...). The set of specific Bormann's actions gives rise to a strange feeling: "What is it all about? » It's all just some sort of recommendations being sent out. And this despite the fact that Reichsleiter Bormann among his direct subordinates, Gauleiters, like

at least four were devout Catholics. There were also Protestants. The Gauleiter of Swabia, Karl Weil, openly declared that he "throws Bormann's dispatches into the fireplace without reading them." The Gauleiter of Silesia, Josef Wagner, treated Bormann much worse and refused to "carry out any anti-Christians on the territory of his Gau."

Burning world. Reboot

which shares. Gauleiter of Southern Hannover-Braunschweig Bernhard Rust "sent" Bormann, however, having previously enlisted the support of Goering-Goebbels. But what sort of "anti-Christian actions" by Bormann were we talking about? What Rust thwarted at the time was... "a proposal to close theology departments at German universities." And on June 9, 1941, Bormann sent out, as historians write, "the infamous blast." The document stated "about the incompatibility of Nazism and religion, about the fact that the ideology of the party is based on a scientific basis, about the need to overcome "religious particularism".

Numerous appeals to Hitler with protests followed. The Führer was indignant and ordered the purse to be confiscated. Bormann backpedaled, declaring that he was not the author of the text, but an assistant who had already been punished was sent to the front. In general, well, Reichsleiter Bormann does not reach his iron film image performed by Yuri Vizbor... And, finally, the pinnacle of "Bormann's persecution" is the intrigue against Gauleiter Josef Wagner, who did not marry his daughter Gerda to SS Karl Weil for leaving the church. And Bormann still arranged it that way. that Hitler rudely expelled Wagner from the Congress of Party Leaders. But other participants in the congress commented with contempt that it was Bormann "buzzing the Führer's ears ... and even during the most difficult period of the war ... and the Fuhrer's nerves simply could not stand it." Then Bormann also achieved the return of Wagner to the Supreme Party Court of the NSDAP, which ... completely sided with the persecuted Catholic Wagner. Just as futile were Bormann's attempts to abolish the service of chaplains in the Wehrmacht.

Cross - Swastika On March 23, 1933, Hitler named the Christian churches

Wie "an important element in preserving the soul of the German people". In April, at a secret session of the Consistory, the Pope

: Igor Shumeiko

Roman Pius XI approved Hitler's struggle against Bolshevism. In June, a joint pastoral message from all German bishops called for cooperation with the new regime.

On June 20, 1933, a German concordat was signed with the Vatican. Vice-Chancellor von Papen, who signed it for Germany, recalls Mussolini's words: "This concordat will for the first time strengthen confidence in your government abroad."

And further von Papen: "Hitler declared to his radical colleagues that his plans for perestroika could only be carried out in an atmosphere of religious tolerance..."

Michael von Faulhaber, Cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church in the Reich, reported to the Pope about... perestroika in Germany and brought approval and support from there. Von Faulhaber: "Germany extended its hand to the papacy, the greatest moral force in the history of the world... this is truly a great and good gesture, raising to a new level the authority of Germany in the West, in the East, throughout the world. We sincerely, from the bottom of our hearts, wish: God bless our Reichkaniler, for our people need him."

His 1933 Christmas sermon: "The Church's point of view does not contain any contradictions to racial studies and racial culture. There are no contradictions to the desire to preserve the national characteristics of the people, to maintain its purity and authenticity, to favor the revival of the national spirit on the basis of blood ties."

When in 1936 the Swiss leaders called on their flock to pray for the death of Hitler, Cardinal von Faulhaber accused them of apostasy from Christianity and appealed: "Catholics, we will now all pray together for the life of the Führer."

Well, there is one more well-known page of cooperation — the rescue, the flight of hundreds of Nazis with the help of primary channels, connections, documents.

World War II. Reboot

Even before the NSDAP came to power, the Protestants tried to establish contacts with it. In 1932, the pro-Nazi Movement of German Christians was created. In 1933, an 800,000-strong evangelical youth organization officially joined the Hitler Youth.

The charter of the new Imperial Church was developed, which was supposed to unify the entire Protestant part of the Reich. (The fact that this was not done is, by the way, another example of what Speer in his testimonies called "heterogeneity, the feudal conglomerate of the Reich.")

Of course, it is necessary to mention the opposition of some Protestants to the Nazi regime. On September 21, 1933, the Emergency Pastors' Union, or Confessional Church, was formed. By the beginning of 1934, 7,000 priests had joined it. They were very bold, but also very selective, in their criticism of Nazi policies. They condemned the persecution of the Jews, publicly prayed for them, but also supported Germany's withdrawal from the League of Nations. Many of these courageous people were repressed.

And one more, very characteristic example of the Nazi religious policy. The occupied Crimea was inhabited by Karaites who professed Judaism. (By the way, Marshal Yakubovsky and the poet Selvinsky were Karaites.) SS experts carefully studied historical documents, anthropometric data of Karaite prisoners of war and confirmed that the Karaites belong to the Turkic group... The result was not only no repressions, but was even discovered (in Eviatoria) Jewish temple for the Karaites. So the Crimean land, rich in diversity, gave such a unique picture in world history: "The Waffen-SS solemnly open ... a synagogue! »

To complete the presentation, it would be necessary to mention dozens of "self-made theories", such as "Ariachristian

258 Igor Shumeiko

stva", who tried to fit Christianity under all sorts of "Nordic", "Chariy" points. All of them are beautifully and fascinatingly (as far as the boredom of the original material allows) analyzed in the book by Dmitry Zhukov. The only remark is a half-objection to Zhukov. Having perfectly studied the genesis of the "occult-Reich" nonsense, having outlined their source, the books of Rauschning, he, Zhukov, also awards Henry Picker's book "Hitler's Table Talk" with the same epithet "doubtful". Although he (Zhukov) himself recognizes and mentions the facts of the enormous, fundamental difference between these books. Henri Picker indeed from March 1942 took Hitler's shorthand, indeed he received the notes of his predecessor, Heinrich Greim. And Zhukov's distrust is caused only by the fact that Picker was in British captivity and the general "confusion of Hitler's statements". But straightness is precisely the property of directed falsifications. And so - the whole situation "in the Hitler refectory." rare replicas of the environment, and most importantly, the general style of Hitler's monologues, are amazingly reliable and stylistically coincide with fragments from Speer's notes. (Indirect confirmation.) And the combination of confusion, complacency and Hitler's paranoid obstinacy on some of the most diverse points, such as "front-line, window experience in the First World War", "vegetarianism", "Jews" (yes, exactly in such a follower - frequency of mentions!) - this is exactly the facsimile accuracy of the appearance and manner of the Führer, recorded in the book, who by 1942 had achieved the fact that even his devoted listeners exchanged glances at the table at the next meeting of the Adolf lamina ... However all of this, of course. — front of the work of textologists and psychologists. We came to another conclusion: There was no impassable

gulf between Hitler's religious policy and modern politically correct standards.

World War II. Reboot

Belarusian President Lukashenka not politically correct? Are the attempts of the Russian authorities to single out four historically rooted religions here in Russia and restrict all kinds of sectarians and Scientologists – also not politically correct? Let it be!

However, then you, the bodies issuing this "Certificate of Political Correctness", must recognize one of the two. Or:

1) Adolf and Co. were politically correct, respecting freedom of conscience.

Or:

2) Political correctness is just a kind of pseudo-scientific synonym for a concept that simply means political obedience to Washington and Brussels.

So scientific and historical research, finally

The theme of the film "UFO of the Third Reich", shown on the Rossiya TV channel on September 2, 2006, is very close to this tricky task – turning Hitler into Harry Potter. The author of the film is Vitaly Pravdivtsev, Goldmedium company.

The recipe is about the same. "Let the theme of fascism of the 20th century be the blue sea. So let's dissolve it in the Popsy Ocean. All the same UFOs, time travel, the secret society Ahnenerbe, Tibet, Shambhala, the Thule Country, the Bermuda Triangle, Antarctica (further with all the stops). Generous scatterings of photographs of someone's drawings (and vice versa, someone's drawings from memory from photographs seen once) - in general, Hitler had flying saucers, partly invisible to the enemy. Even the brands are indicated: "Vril", "Belonso" (the latter seemed to be more expensive). Combat purpose? To plant a serious bomb load on these fragile and very thin creatures made of unknown metals is, of course, even a fantasy.

| Igor Shumeiko

There are not enough "scientific pop writers". Then - just will be observers! Probably, "from the plates" you can see something from the enemy that you can't see from all the planes ("frames" of the Focke-Wulf-189).

The cymbal engines were both "ordinary" and... "techno-magical" Schauburger. The technologies of these engines were secretly taken out by the "Ahnenerbers" from ... of course! From where else — from Tibet! (On camels.)

Well. Of course, the fate of Hitler - here already the merging of the "scientific-documentary" film of the Russian TV channel with the above-mentioned prussian-mystical corpus of works - is absolutely complete. Hitler nevertheless outwitted the allies, in vain did Stalin chase SMERSHEVIEV after his corpse. The Fuhrer sailed on half boats, and then flew on saucers with "techno-magic engines" to Antarctica. There, in 1947, the American fleet attacked... In the same place, in Antarctica, a point of special "worm passages" to the star Vega...

The only thing I fear is that those who have not seen this film will suspect that the author of this book has deliberately chosen some kind of children's program for the subject of revelations and is now making fun of filmmakers, and even ... "generalizes".

No. I assure you, the film is absolutely serious, popular science. Dozens of "specialists" were involved. Captain 1st Rank Viktor Berezhnoy testifies: "Yes, in the region of the South Georgia Islands, in 1979 we observed Nech110 ... very anomalous."

Doctor of sciences (albeit, economics) Vladimir Vasiliev (Institute of the USA and Canada) - about the same. More precisely, the doctor reported on American control stations at both poles, in Antarctica and Alaska, that same worm-and-worm passage, along which, like on an escalator: bang! — and you are already on the star Vega.

In principle, this is, of course, a worldwide trend: more and more people are learning to accept their own,

World War II. Reboot

even different, class-individual doses of information about science, art — only in a pop-dissolved, sensationally flavored, glamorous-caramelized form.

Thoughtful analysts, even in the field of Big Science, have noted one important trend of the last decades. Previously, Science was looking for the Truth, today it serves the Information needs of the society. This, if you think about it, is a very subtle difference. After all, here we are talking about the redirection of real, Big Science. This, in fact, is the ideology of the reform of our RAS, which is taking place these very days. They say that the Society itself will better order what and where to look for, discover, invent. Or (which is very familiar to us.) The Invisible Hand of the Market will put everything in its place, give orders to some scientists, and down with others. Interesting. what kind of Market could order Newton to discover his laws, or Roentgen to discover his rays? Is it possible to order an outfit like this: "Open for me, brother... what is not there."

And so, if even Big Science is placed to serve the information needs of society, then what can we say about such subdivisions of it that stand on the verge of Science and Scientific Pop? Or, let's get closer to our topic, what will happen to the science of History? It seems that (it must be admitted) the "historical shelves" in bookstores are "bursting with goods". This commodity sells well — the "need of society" was correctly calculated by the publishers. But what about these needs? When (with current trends) even Herodotus and Tacitus cannot be sold without the announcement of "Sensation", "New Revelations!", and something about the sexual orientation of the authors.

And... now strictly on the theme of the book: the trick is that this universal, worldwide trend of "opposing history" is not at all equally harmful worldwide. And if the author of the science-pop film Vitaly Pravdiviev can brush aside the accusations: "Why?! Everyone is filming about Hitler, Tibet, Loch Ness - here I am! › Here we have

34:2 Igor Shumeiko

the right to apply the same postulate as to the satanic-magical pop from the past heads...

For Denmark, which fought in World War II for an hour and a half and lost 15 people, Hitler, who flew to Antarctica on a flying saucer, today means NOT THE SAME THING as for Russia!

Therefore, the question to the TV channel bearing the name "Russia" can be easy, like:

— And the power of the Schauburger Techno-Magic Engine installed on the Vril flying saucers is measured, what, in horse-magic powers?

And you can ask a little more strictly:

— And you, dear Rossiya channel, noticed that your film is a contribution to:

1) making sense of World War II and Russian and world history in general;

2) the aestheticization of fascism.

The latter (the danger of aestheticizing fascism) was interestingly written (available on websites) by science fiction writer Nick Perumov. Indeed, plates, interplanetary ships, spaceports — and all with swastikas, and around very recognizable slender figures in leather plaids, caps with high crowns and stacks — all this just begs to be included in children's albums and youthful wall posters.

The only paradox is that today such a “swastika sci-pop” in Germany would not even be allowed close to the screens ...

And at the end of this "RK-chapter" - evidence of the relevance of the topic, examples of "RK technologies" in the coverage of the War. What is called. "from the news of the last hour." The placement of some of the final touches of this book took place in August 2006, which made it possible to attach the next speech of President Bush.

Thursday, September 7, 2006, according to Reuters:

World War II. Reboot

“The world has paid a 'terrible price' by ignoring Lenin's words,” US President George W. Bush said in a speech on Tuesday. He spoke to members of the American Military Officers Association. “The Soviet empire, which he (Lenin) founded, destroyed tens of millions and brought the world to the brink of thermonuclear war,” the US President emphasized. Bush warned . Bin Laden and his terrorist allies state their intentions as clearly as Lenin and Hitler did before them.

The head of the White House said that the United States will not stop in its fight against terrorism "until the threat to civilization is eliminated."

Two explanations.

1) For all compatriots who have happily avoided intrusion into the everyday lexicon of advertising terminology. Bush's performance is precisely “positioning” in the classical advertising and RK sense. The object is not characterized, but “positioned”, that is, it is placed on a par with others, to which the relation has already been formed. So, Lenin is put on a par with Bin Laden and Hitler. He, they say, “also threatened, they also did not listen, he also exterminated millions.”

It seems ridiculous to justify Lenin here: after the First World War there were many revolutions, threats - everyone threatened, but it was Lenin's "threats" that turned out to be the most unsupported. The United States was attacked by those who did not threaten. And today, Bush "to hem into the case of Lenin" the lyrics of the song "We will destroy the whole world of violence," this ... judge for yourself - what it is.

Further. according to “Bushism”: “His (Lenin's) power brought the world to the brink of nuclear war” – this is about the very time when the USSR, being surrounded by dozens of US bases

264 Igor Shumeiko

(American bases in Gurtzia were generally close to the Soviet border), I tried the only time to start my own, similar, in Cuba. The “Caribbean Crisis” is the only Soviet attempt to achieve parity in nuclear bases, and a very shameless politician keeps silent about the fact that only the United States has so far waged a nuclear war. More precisely, he is sure that with such a skillful "positioning of Lenin with Hitler and Bin Laden" the whole world will forget Hiroshima, "<... who put the world on the brink of nuclear war, and who - beyond the brink ...".

2) And the second explanation, for some fellow citizens who harbor illusions about the United States. Like withdrawing from the ABM treaty, the United States has left the system of any moral framework. Their kind, eternal international mediator, Nobel Peace Prize winner, ex-Pres-

President Jimmy Carter has long assumed the function of a "good investigator". And the other "investigator" is this very Bush. He knows very well that Al-Qaeda was created by the United States (but did not "manage control"), however, he sticks it, Al-Qaeda, to "Lenin" and, as can be seen from his RK context, to Russia. And just in time for the fifth anniversary of the New York terrorist attack.

Hitler disposed of the bones and hair of his victims - Bush also decides:

"Why 3,000 victims go to waste. Let's use Memory 0 to train them for current political goals. This is the American state RK. And our citizens are simply obliged to be aware: What? on whom? By whom? trained, trained... "members of the American Association of Military Officers".

Example 2. European RK. And also, unfortunately, underestimated.

July 2006, war in Lebanon. euronews, a quiet, politically correct channel, in each of its reports

World War II. Reboot

chivoly, 6 or 7 times he repeated: "Hizbollah is shelling Israeli cities from its Katyushas, ... the answer ^v is on Hezbollah's Katyushas ... Hezbollah is left with Katyushas."

That is, they used to complain about "jammers", now in the "Open Society" on the territory of Russia, on a frequency. yielded until 10 o'clock in the morning by our channel "Culture", quiet Europeans carefully, gradually. but also stubbornly "position". After all, absolutely any installations, of any production, launching jet-powered projectiles - all of them can be compared with each other, but here it is ... They used our "brand" - the installation that worked for their liberation in 1941-1945 .

To what extent our compatriots still do not understand the laws of this merciless RK war, I was reminded by an example that is already quite far from us. Almost immediately after the collapsed towers, a bacteriological attack began on the United States, do you remember the envelopes with white powder? And all our media then repeated: "Anthrax, anthrax!" This, the final example of the chapter, is no longer about "their" cunning, but about our own ignorance. After all, the very disease that we so willingly married with the name of our main pantry is called Anthrax in the West. The author of this book followed the wave of idiocy and self-substitution of that time, if I may say, with "peripheral vision"...

So, it is in this "RK chapter" that I introduce myself to the reader as:

... a journalist, "PR man", took part in the struggle for the return to Russia of our famous vodka brands ("Stolinnaya", "Moskovskaya", etc. from the well-known "Union Fruit List", 43 brands in total), my The article "RiPoy and Smirnov5" was the first presentation on a vodka superbrand stolen from Russia, which at that time brought in \$360 million a year to the Grand Metropolitan Concern's Hubline.

| Igor Shumeiko

And when our TV commentators scattered all over the world in their parrot robes frequented the cameras: "Anthrax, anthrax", my first thought, which flashed almost instantly, was: "But how?! After all, we sell Sibirskaya vodka all over the world! Not "Stolichka", of course, but also quite a working brand"

Then I remembered Siberian Airlines, Siberian Aluminum, Sibneft...etc. Well, then I remembered the words of dear old Madeleine Albright, Secretary of State under Clinton, and today the head of the National Democratic Institute: "It is unfair that all the wealth of Siberia belongs only to Russians."

And most importantly! Back then (autumn 2001), Bush, thrashing about with a scorched tail, hadn't even gotten around to using this "Siberian self-set-up" in the way he positions today "Lenin's power that brought the world to the brink of nuclear war"!

The Western media then more often used (I specifically looked through English-language articles about the threat of poison in envelopes) their own name for the new world threat: "anthrax". And only our teleparrots, whose business trips, if we trace them to the end, were paid for in the end by Siberian oil and gas, thoughtlessly repeated then:

"... An ulcer! ... an ulcer!

I hope that all the above examples will show our compatriots What and Who surrounds us. And somehow it will partially illustrate the complex multidimensional process that the title of the book hints at: "Second World War. Reboot"..

Chapter 19 and "Duty Properly Understood"

Our victory in the Second World War, defeat in the cold one, the continuity of the United Europe (Berlin and Brussels) - all this must be firmly integrated into a single historical process. The terms "Big War", "Right of the Big War" should serve to explain the difficult indigestible facts not only of that war, but also of the subsequent period. Any country that has repulsed deadly aggression is obliged to take measures against possible repeated attempts. The Soviet Union, as has been said many times, fought not only with Germany, but also with Europe. Therefore, Stalin was obliged to take measures: to tear off not only from Germany - East Germany, the NOIU of Europe - Eastern Europe. Roosevelt and Churchill, who fought and were intimately familiar with the Great War, recognized this right of the Soviet Union. And that is very significant. they recognized this not in Tehran. at the height of the war, in Yalta. a few weeks before its end, and 3 (three) months after the USSR (throw to the Oder) helped them repulse the last German attack in the Ardennes.

This Right of the USSR (to material, territorial guarantees against a repetition of aggression) had as its consequence the Duty — the arrangement of buffer territories. Was the task hopeless? In principle, with the idea of its "functional" existence of the state of this republic

268 Igor Shumeiko

Gion were well acquainted - they performed the role of a "cordon sanitaire" against the USSR in the 1920s and 1930s more or less skillfully. In Europe, Hitler was also quite diligent. Resources? (The cordon sanitary service, of course, must be paid.) But that period was just uniquely characteristic: almost every month colonies fell away from the Western bloc, and in the USSR, as with a wave of a magic wand, that second Baku (not-oily Volga region), then "Siberian pantries". The communist victories in China and Indonesia were seen as almost decisive in the geopolitical duel.

Against was only a weak experience of economic and social organization (and in comparison, for example, with the German in the Baltics, one can say, and its complete lack of experience). And, of course, the lack of "theory". Although, if you think about it, the Communists had a very solid temporary head start, a reserve of confidence. These are the years of restoration, removal of rubble (and in the literal sense of the word as well). Simple and real work. Figuratively speaking, they can also set up chains of people passing bricks...

Again, and from any responsibility for this destruction (and the war), the communists were absolutely farthest away. And objectively, "in truth", the furthest of all, and, what is very important, in the public consciousness, also the farthest of most parties and groups. In other words, when the surviving world faced the gigantic question: "How did this happen? (fascism)" - everyone from lawyers and philosophers to writers and filmmakers. in their work, they compiled their lists of the guilty, those involved. And if all these honors are summed up in one final one, the communists will rightly be the last ones there. In this direction, even the well-known, as it were,

“private determination” of the Nuremberg Tribunal against the philosopher Nietzsche – after all, the “forerunner of fascism” (Nietzsche, according to the Nuremberg verdict) was at the same time the most famous and consistent enemy of the “communist project”.

World War II. Reboot

In general, that was the era “before the Rezuns”, and to equate, for example, the gigantic, geopolitical fact of Munich with some note in the margins of Trotsky’s Mexican diary “... but Stalin also probably wanted to ...” - it hasn't even crossed Buk's head yet.

But when the rubble on both sides of the “Iron Curtain” was raked and it was necessary to move farther, and here the lack of a theory (real, working), which worried Stalin so much, began to gradually become realized ... And the new Kremlin generations, it seems, already did not really know what it was about. (The slogans for the First/Seventh Day were drawn and hung up, which means that “the point on ideology can be considered closed.”)

But the question “how this vacuum was filled” is directly related to the topics mentioned above. Again, a typical example of the lagging behind of our “ideologists”. Through the efforts of our scientists, industrialists, and military theorists, the concept of “asymmetric response” has long been established and therefore does not require explanation. There are well-known examples when, during the “arms race”, in response to the multibillion-dollar US threats, our scientists offered an ALMOST “penny” response in a different plane of confrontation, which, however, completely neutralized the threat ... But here ... precisely our “ideologists” missed a biting “asymmetric response” in their field.

From the enemies of “Marxism-Leninism”, “Capital”, etc. they were expecting an answer, denials in roughly the same format. That ideological rivals “on the other side of the curtain” are writing their “Anti-Manifesto”, “Anti-Capital” (it was like “Anti-Dühring”). And these “antitomes” will probably come to us along the routes of the same Iskra. Because so diligently, proactively. and bombed poor Johnny Keynes, or Convergence Theory. Keynes's books, perhaps, most of all resembled in outward signs “their answer to us.”

But the actual answers turned out to be absolutely “asymmetric”. the First and Second World Wars “mar

279 Igor Shumeiko

Xism-Leninism” explained through (remember?): “the law of uneven development of the imperialist powers”.

But Bush, in the same cited interview with our NTV on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the end of World War II, explained the main fault of fascism: “non-observance of the rights of minorities.” And the whole point of the Great War and Victory is the worldwide assertion of the rights of minorities.

This interview is “not a passing one”, and today it can be found on the official website of the US State Department. And even the context of that conversation was, as far as possible. benevolent towards Russia. There, after the most important recognition of the equal responsibility of the USSR, the USA, Britain for the post-war order of the world, the division into spheres of influence and the Yalta system, this passage follows. An NTV correspondent (Vladimir Solovyov) pointed out to Mr. Bush the facts of the infringement of Russians and the fascistization of Latvian politics. And Bush promised to protect, point out Vaira-Freiberga.

State Department announcement:

“President Bush says the experience of World War II highlights the need for tolerance. “Respect for democracy means respect for the rights of minorities,” the president tells Russian television.

“QUESTION: In Russia, we are very concerned about the growth of neo-Nazism in the Baltic States, when Russian war veterans are publicly humiliated, when monuments to Russian soldiers are desecrated, and at the same time, on May 8, it is planned to open a monument to the Nazi brigade, which is well known not only for combat operations against the Russians, but also for some rather nasty things that were common for the SS troops.

PRESIDENT: Yes. When I go to the Baltic countries, I will have this message: it is important to respect democracy, but to respect democracy means to respect the rights of less

World War II. Reboot 271

shinstvo. In other words, true democracy proclaims that minorities are important and that the will of the majority cannot suppress the minority.

As for whether countries honor Nazism, of course, this should be rejected. Nazism was defeated. We celebrate the defeat of Nazism. We do not want Nazism to return. The extremist point of view is that it is possible to violate the rights of minorities. The Nazis exterminated millions of Jews, for example, and this is a classic example of how the rights of minorities were violated. And we must never forget the lessons of why we fought together during World War II. Therefore, I look forward to making this call for tolerance.”

That's what this example is good for: even a positive (for Russia) move by Bush still leaves a feeling of mutual incomprehension, a feeling of slight absurdity. Absurdity - against the background of this almost touching concern: well, finally there is a place where these Russians are a minority! So, let's splurge!! (Conclusion: Yes, you always and everywhere be a minority, and our protection is guaranteed to you.) And most importantly, he is absolutely sincere. Indeed, the instincts - they do not lie! He will protect!

It reminded me of the following story. One French count bred large and valuable fish (sturgeon, I think) in his ponds. Neighbor, drooling. I remembered the unshakable instinct (innate reflex) of a diving dog: to dive and pull everything that moves in the water ashore. And here is the cunning one. sneaking in, he drove the dog into the count's pond. And that faithful diver pulled out — “rescued” — sturgeons.

From the “other side”, of course, they can correct it: in the conditions of the TV interview, the president mentioned “minority rights” for brevity. but in general the whole complex of “human rights” was meant. But there is no mistake here, and Bush is right in his own way, in his own way.

Igor Shumeiko

for the entire “Bill of Rights” (about a dozen “Amendments to the US Constitution”) to the observance of the rights of minorities, precisely as an indicator. Approximately in the same way, environmental scientists absolutely justifiably simplify: “If there are crayfish in the river, then this river is clean.” That is: openly marching through the streets of a minority, some Scientologists, or, let's say, gays (perhaps now the “cancer analogy” has influenced) - “means, with other matters (freedom of the press, conscience, assembly)”, also everything is completely OK!

It is, of course, wild for us to even imagine that someone has a model for the development of the world, which he considers correct, working, valid, and where the spring that sets the whole world in motion is the struggle for the rights of minorities (well, or even but for the whole “Bill of Rights”)! And that the Russians in Latvia will be protected not because they fought against the German-Latvian fascists, but because at the moment they are a clear statistical minority! (National!)

Or, for comparison, imagine a “lecture in the trenches of 1945” addressed to those soldiers who are just now pouring their blood over, extinguishing the furnaces of Auschwitz. Imagine a political officer instructing: “Now you will go on the attack, you will go under fire, but you must

in the evening, take the settlement of Auschwitz (Oswiecim) — know that you are going to fight for the sacred, for the rights of minorities... well, a clean yellow house.

Yes, it is unlikely that the soldiers landing in Normandy were told “about the terrible, inhuman threat hanging over the minority, over the entire Parisian gay bohemian:!! Know, fighters, that there, in Paris, Henri Gide is now waiting for you! Cocteau!..”

And, having completed this circle of examples, let us now return to the “asymmetric responses” in ideology. So when did these “values” (consciences-assemblies-minority-presses) really appear at the forefront of world politics?

By the way, it will seem to someone that in this friendly four (the one in the line above, in brackets), one reinforces the other, and each reinforces each and all together. Bush, for example

World War II. Reboot

Well, I seem to be sure of this... as well as in the “Great World War for the rights of minorities”... But after all, many may think exactly the opposite, that one discredits the other. And then, having suspected the freedom of Conscience/Press/Assembly — in a simple cover for their “ally” from the friendly four “minorities”, he will probably only be even more critical, even more suspicious of the very freedoms of Conscience/Press .

That's why, dear reader, in this story “World War II. Reboot” included both the topic “War and justice” (Six feathers from each goose of the kingdom), and “Problems of the RV department of the Corporation “Russian Federation””. Yes, we, as Andropov rightly noted, “do not know the society in which we live.” But what if you still try to “find out”? Here we must turn, first of all, to War.

In addition, I had another external reason: by the time those chapters were written, the epic, Viktor Pravdyuk's film “World War II. Russian version”. And after all the stories about the siege of Leningrad, the battle of Moscow, Stalingrad, the Kursk Bulge, the war on the Western Front, the author in his own, somewhere ... 57th - 60th series (numbers are approximate, and the titles of the series: “Lessons in the Crimson Light of the Results”, “Who Won the Second World War?”) - finally got to ... “historical conclusions” ... And at the same time he began - convincingly and uncontrollably ... seat - to go into a galosh.

To these “Lessons in the Crimson Light of the Results” we still. of course, we'll be back. And by no means only for the presentation of fair “counterclaims” against the United Europe (Berlin and Brussels), but also for essential self-knowledge. Yes, finding one's own history, “knowing one's country”, of course, is much more important. than all these “pokes” and “pointing to the place” by former subjects of Hitler.

As History, with the knowledge of one's country, people, such a thing turns out that, except in turning points,

Igor Shumeiko

cops to comprehend anything is almost impossible. It seems that in other, calm periods they are a people, a country, just “things in themselves”. Well, imagine that Alexander Sergeevich would transfer the action of his “Boris Godunov” from 1605 somewhere deep into his successful reign. And this (the choice is rich) - and 14 years of “premiership” under Fyodor Ioannovich (Belgorod was founded, equipped, fortified, and the entire region of the current Black Earth region was populated). Or the no less economically successful “seven-year plan” of Godunov's own reign. What would we learn about the soul of the people, mysteriously, incomprehensibly how, but still broken by the oprichnina and Ivan the Terrible? What would we learn about the “successfully overfulfilled seven-year plan” of the country on the very eve of the Time of Troubles?

According to the practice that has already developed in this book - looking for some unerasable examples and more or less original illustrations as an example of comprehending one's Country, War, History - I will cite two poems. (More precisely, even one and a half: one in its entirety, the other in excerpts.)

Their external reason is completely, absolutely identical: the participation of the Italians in the war with us. And this is very useful: in such particulars, secondary (supposedly) degrees, the meaning of the General is better revealed.

So, let's start with that sketchy one. In the sixth grade, I think. By the Victory Day, we were learning the "literary and artistic composition". They just stood in a line and read in turn the most famous poems about the war. I got this:

A black cross on the chest of an Italian, No carving, no pattern, no gloss.

Protected by a poor family, And carried by his only son.

[597>`I

World War II. Reboot

... — AND SOMETHING There further —

... A young native of Naples, What did you leave in Russia on the field?

I remember well that the whole poem was built on these Russian-Italian rhymes ... like

... I also dreamed of riding in a gondola in the Volga region at least once ... But, after all, bullets mon
whistled

Above the sacred land of Raphael...

... I tried to recall those "sense-forming" Russian-Italian rhymes of the poem, but I stopped trying, catching myself that I no longer remember, but think out (about our folk nonsense "Lucina" and their "Santa Lucia").

And quite deliberately, I now did not begin to look for the name of the author, the full correct text. Let it remain so, as I remember it 37 (approximately) years ago. Sonorous, beautiful, included in the classics of Soviet poetry. The author, if nevertheless found, will definitely turn out to be one of the top ten of our poets. Rozhdestvensky, Mezhirov, Narovchatov, Simonov-Svetlov, Voznesensky-Yevtushenko... Or maybe even one of them, the ones listed above.

Doesn't matter.

For all of the above is only a necessary introduction to that other work, which shows quite unexpectedly, amazingly unexpectedly! — which, it turns out, can be seen behind the same particular (Italian) case.

I don't even know if it can be called a poem — one detail is incredible for this genre. immediately catches the eye: the epigraph is almost longer than the text itself.

276 Igor Shumeiko

petrarch

"... And now an unusual, but already endless line of forced people of both sexes darkens this most beautiful city with Scythian features and disorderly confusion, like a muddy stream over a clean river; if they were not dearer to their customers than to me, if they did not please their eyes more than mine, the inglorious tribe would not crowd along the local narrow alleys,

it would sadden with unpleasant meetings the visitors, accustomed to the best pictures, but in the depths of their Scythia, together with thin and pale Need among the stony field, where Nazon placed her (Need) with teeth and nails, meager plants would tear. Virochem, enough about that.

Petrarch. From a letter to Guido Setta, Archbishop of Genoa. 1367 Venice".

So he wrote several years before Kulikov's sacred thunderstorm. How he would act is not a secret, If given him power, not a word.

So he wrote in a cherished style, So he looked at our brother. Overgrown with 6 these meetings came true, That once darkened him.

After all, six centuries have passed

Above the heavenly and stone vault.

But the soul of a humanist has grown

A vague fear of the Scythian razbrov.

Like a magnet pulled the horizon, Where strangers are burning Palestine.

He ended up on the Voronezh front And ran for the yards and barns.

World War II. Reboot

In forty-three, in a fierce wind, the Italians staggered the cacti, Peeling off the bark with their nails.

From under the snow with scarce plants.

He wandered around the rear, like a spirit, And chewed last year's leaves. He begged for bread from the old women - He recognized these Scythian faces.

And no one drove from the threshold,

Bread and shelter sharing with the poet. He got to know the others too late. But I found out. And enough about that.

It's just unbelievable, the hand reaches out to rub your eyes - but the feeling of a miracle remains. So Moses, probably, looked at the burning bush or parted waters. By some completely incomprehensible movement (perhaps, by a shift in the angle of view), one absolutely particular case suddenly becomes an understandable step in world history; and this "staircase" itself suddenly received a completely unexpected illumination.

It suddenly becomes clearly visible, clearer than a solved crossword puzzle, this really poet and scientist, Petrarch, MEP. He came to Russia is understandable. Today he would probably be a "great humanist." in 1941 not to "rob", and not even "under the compulsion of an evil Duce", but as a "great poet, scientist and humanist". Dante, Petrarch. Creators of the "new beautiful world"... Europe, Culture, Renaissance. And suddenly in this bright and reasonable world - like some kind of stain or swirling fear in the corner. Either some kind of "systemic", military-political threat, or a gloomy surge of the subconscious. And the creator of the "correct world" — he, of course, will reach out, go there in order to explore and get rid of his "vague fear of the Scythian confusion"... And there Petrarch will see that very Need — about

278 | Igor Shumeiko

once, born to a predecessor, Nazon, who was exiled to Scythia by Emperor Augustus. And he will "tear the meager plants with his nails." And "recognizes those Scythian faces"...

And not just a testament to the skill of the author, our Poet, but also amazingly, philosophically important, the convergence of these two texts, Italian and Russian, at one point becomes - "and enough about that." Like two rays converging at the top, at the point of dazzling insight. After all, the Italian could cut off those paintings of his Slavic humiliation and disgrace in his letter to the archbishop simply because he was too lazy to describe anything else here. Or sorry ink. And he could ... - because of the pity, compassion, generosity that filled him. And what exactly - boredom or pity - is unknown to the readers of the text of the letter. Perhaps this was not known even to Petrarch himself, who threw away his pen at that moment: "enough about that." And it is here that the Russian beam, the text of the Russian Poeta, converging to the same point, as if illuminates the subconscious of the Italian, affirms in him the best of the options: Generosity. Yes, yes, that was compassion. And, "having recognized these Scythian faces", he, the famous Petrarch, himself became better, more enlightened. Great wars end with generosity.

This is the contribution to the entire world humanization of the Voronezh old women, who fed the unfortunate Italian, the Noeschi, the Russian Poet, the interlocutor of Petrarch, the author of this masterpiece.

But this contribution of our Poet also puts a very difficult choice before his compatriots and colleagues (or those who consider themselves to be such). After all, this is the Scale. The level of comprehension of the World War is presented. World history. And here (colleagues?) there are options: 1) either admit, admit that because of you, it is on your book that this Level will suddenly drop. 2) Or, as they used to say, they scared each other in the 70s and 80s: "to go to the machine tool", "to the tractor". Or...

World War II. Reboot 279

SH LILETANI REQUEST

So who is this poet who so successfully brought together Petrarch, Mussolini's unfortunate soldiers with Russian, world history?

(Pause). It seems like a pleasant thing to "advertise" our poetic genius, but it seems like it's even a shame that this should be done.

So, this Poet is Yuri Polikarpovich Kuznetsov.

That's what is called - "deal with the topic." Not only to lay siege to some Lithuanians, pulling the Account (for the fact that they were given two and not, say, three times their capital Vilnius). After all, the most important thing is also to advance the comprehension of one's own history...

Of the disputes that once boiled, one popular question now comes to mind: "Who and when will write a new War and Peace? It meant - the Book of the Great Patriotic War. Yes. Such a book would greatly help the development of national self-consciousness. The very fact of the existence of such a huge and meaningless event (War) is even dangerous in its own way. It is even dangerous, and especially for today's Russians. By its rawness, indigestion, thoughtlessness. This gigantic topic will still attract public consciousness. And in the absence of a new Leo Tolstoy, all sorts of people will crawl through, up to the cuts. And what they said instead of enlightenment and unity will only deepen the lines of splits in the national mentality.

"War and Peace", as we remember, was called "the greatest novel ever written" by the Frenchman Romain Rolland. Although the "Tolstoy Napoleon" is, perhaps, the most vile and insignificant in the entire "Napoleonian" ...

And Pravdyuk - well, what about Pravdyuk? He collected worthy documentary material, but as soon as it came to "historical conclusions," he slipped below the level of the Korotych Ogonyok.

Now quickly "according to Pravdyuk's points."

280 Igor Shumeiko

1) Constantly repeated (I counted more than eight times): "Germany, together with the USSR, defeated Poland."

But then, after all, Britain, together with Germany, defeated Denmark (the introduction of troops into Iceland). Britain, together with Germany, defeated France (recall that the destruction of the French fleet in Mers-el-Kebir happened BEFORE the French signed peace with Germany).

2) Announced: it is a pity that the Nuremberg Trials were carried out by the winners. That it would be better to give this business to Ireland, Sweden, Switzerland - neutrals. Because the Winners were in the end just as cruel as the Nazis.

Oh, what a pity that today's "Political Correspondence Show" was not staged then in Nuremberg! Let the Swedes, who provided Hitler with steel, or the Swiss, who ensured the safety of Nazi gold, weighed the responsibility of each of the parties ...

The authors of the film Pravdyuk and Co. told their story, sitting under the icon. And the topic itself involves an appeal to religious authorities: after all, any court (especially the Nuremberg trials) can in some way be correlated with the main court of mankind - the Last Judgment.

I will try to explain myself with the help of one of the main Christian thinkers: Saint (for Catholics) or Blessed (for Orthodox) Augustine. image of a European man". Augustine's phrase "I believe in order to understand" is repeated in any church in the world. The teacher and anticipator of Petrarch, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche. Martin Luther was considered Augustine's interpreter. Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky, Freud were his students.

Directly about this - about the war, about the degree of guilt - Augustine did not say anything, but there is an analogy - the postulate of the Mass of sin (taza ressei). Original sin plus the conditions of our worldly life lead to its growth. Possidius, Bishop of Kalamsky, disciple and first biographer of Augustine, writes:

World War II. Reboot 231

"He conveyed the instructions that it is proper to follow in life and deeds to a man of God (meaning a priest): not to ask a wife for someone, not to give recommendations to those who are going to serve in the army. In each case, he (Augustine) presented the reason: 1) so that the spouses, quarreling among themselves, do not scold the one who arranged their marriage, the priest should only consolidate the already concluded alliance, bless mutual affection; 2) so that he who has shown himself poorly in military service does not share the shame with the one who recommended him.

"Concrete thinkers" may be perplexed about these rules: after all, family disasters. like failures in the army, rarer options than normal family life and normal service. This means that if the priest nevertheless recommends wives or soldiers for service, the amount of thanks will ultimately outweigh the amount of claims.

But Augustine, the foremost connoisseur of the human soul, would have answered: "They won't outweigh it. They won't overdo it." And this is already relevant to our topic: for example, a million people were liberated from fascist slavery, a thousand died in the process, five hundred were shot - well, in the heat of the moment, suspecting them of complicity, in a combat situation. And what, here you can "turn on statistics"? Throw on the balance sheet a million thanks and fifteen hundred curses?

This is at the very basis of human life: worldly gratitude, as it were, dissolves in worldly life, is consumed in the process of maintaining it, while Sin, the Mass of sin accumulates... Among the discoveries of St. cumulative effect.

Usefulness, that's right, that's why the usefulness that is used disappears. Used is a synonym for empty. Then its "concrete" usefulness will appear, when it happens to it, usefully ... what happens to

gasoline in the combustion chamber. And Sin, it turns out, is a substance of a completely different kind. Theologians long ago deduced the basis of the teaching of Blessed Augustine:

Sin is not overcome by any bunch of good deeds, but only by the Grace of God.

282 Igor Shumeiko

And we must apply this fundamental postulate of Christianity "to our topic." The fact that the military sins of the liberators will be remembered, and the benefits of the liberation forgotten - this is quite in the nature of man. And therefore, trying to avoid this, it is not necessary to curry favor with trawls, to ask them to conduct that Nuremberg trial. Their alleged advantage over the liberators is only in non-participation in the War, that is, in not living through a certain period of life, in not accumulating the Mass of sin.

But this, in fact, is the advantage of a one-year-old baby over an old man. And yet, by the way... (And the genius of Augustine simply could not be out of place). For many years he studied the psychology of infants, talked with mothers, and observed children himself. His conclusion crosses out entire centuries of banal lisp, but it is also sad: "Infants are innocent in their bodily weakness, and not in their souls" ("On the City of God").

So an attempt to "transfer Nuremberg" somewhere to a prosperous, peaceful Stockholm is akin to an attempt to replace judges today (possible bribe-takers and sinners) with a child of two years old ("before this age, he does not know what a bribe is").

And the third fad of Pravdyuk: 3) "Attack" on Marshal Zhukov. Allegedly, Operation Mars was his (Zhukov's) biggest defeat.

It was some American colonel who "opened his eyes" to the authors of the film. They, the authors of the film, seem to get carried away - how terrible everything is, totally hidden, hushed up - and suddenly here it is: "a shocking discovery-exposure of an American colonel."

Indeed, during the Battle of Stalingrad, on another sector of the front, near Rzhev, our troops attacked the Germans for a long time and to no avail, and suffered enormous losses. Looking at this section of the war in isolation, at this separate section of the front, one can really be horrified at the senselessness of our attacks, the enormity of our losses. BUT... And if we link this operation "Mars" with the parallel battle near Stalingrad?" ...

World War II. Reboot 284

No, the geopolitician Andrey Parshev wrote correctly (albeit in a different way): "To understand the whole brilliant strategy of Kutuzov (also criticized by many) is possible only if you understand and recognize the unconditional tactical (on the battlefield) superiority of Napoleon"

And now we just need to recognize the unconditional, overwhelming superiority of the Wehrmacht of that time - in maneuverability, in the speed of transfers and deployment of large military groups, and then the picture will become clearer. The absolute importance and priority of Stalingrad seems to be known to everyone. But after all, it is just as well known that only the transferred Manstein group almost broke through to the encircled 6th Army of Paulus. almost turned the tide of the main battle of the War.

That's why it was necessary to "bind, grind" the Rzhev grouping with the most "senseless and bloody attacks" - because otherwise they (the Germans) would be much faster. it would be more effective to "turn it on" in the south! Much faster and more successful than our "liberated polo Rzhev" armies. Dozens of evidence of this have accumulated over the 4142s. The same Manstein was transferred to the Crimea - and our complete defeat. Our Barvenkovsky ledge near Kharkov - the Germans regrouped, hit, and ... actually from there, from near Kharkov, and marched home to Stalingrad and the Caucasus. And besides, in the previous winter campaign (1941-1942), the Germans were already "sitting in a cauldron" near Demyansk and successfully released! And to

this did not happen again near Stalingrad, it was necessary to tie up all possible "German surpluses" on all fronts!

And here they are, isolated in time or place. examples in the history of warfare are endless. Prove anything and everything. And Wellington's defeat of Waterloo, and the absolute invincibility of Hitler, and the mediocrity of the "butcher Zhukov", and everything, everything, everything ... You just need to isolate the necessary piece from the History chain, like that American colonel. And then ... millions of people initiated into the secret at once will freeze

| Igor Shumeiko

dumbfounded ... "Here the stoker opened our eyes!" - so, it seems, was in one song by Vysotsky (or Galich).

It is impossible to operate with the results of the World War in terms of modern politically correct hangouts. In the interests of Truth, and equally - in the interests of Russia (in principle, also in the interests of other warring countries - Britain, Serbia) not to discuss the last War in modern concepts, but, on the contrary, to consider the current political situation using the criteria of the last War .

If out of every ten international disputes today (for example, about the seizure of oil fields under the guise of "defending democratic freedoms"), at least five are simply translated from "democratic language" into "geopolitical", or into "military-historical", confusion it would be less.

War is, in any case, contact with Reality. Catharsis. tragic cleansing. And politics, conceptual tools, the lexicon itself in times of peace gradually and absolutely inevitably, in the pursuit of momentary benefits, becomes more complicated, confused, and deceived — exactly until the next war. Until the next Catharsis. Actually. the falsity and contradictions of the "peace policy" have always triggered the next war.

Understand, this is by no means an apology for "military style". It is not war that is good, but "peaceful, civic politics" that degenerates into intrigues around a fraction of a percentage of the fooled electorate is bad.

War, in any case, has always brought Peace closer. And "peace" and "peaceful politicians, historiographers, etc." - they (at least until now) have always brought the War closer. And always the "post-war years" slowly turned into "pre-war years".

The stylistic failure of Pravdyuk also hints at a semantic failure. "Lessons in the Crimson Light of Results" - this, you see, is somewhat reminiscent of Vampuku.

Chapter 20 From a former enemy to a former ally (And about one thing, by the way - the anniversary)

60 years ago, on March 5, 1946, at Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri, former British Prime Minister Winston Churchill (acting US President Harry Truman stood a little further away) made his famous speech.

In which, in fact, we were declared a cold war.

In Fulton, a kind of Cold War Museum has developed. Churchill's daughter Lady Mary Soames and his granddaughter Edwina Sandis, as well as Truman's great-nephew, were invited to this anniversary in 2006. The President of the United States, George W. Bush, and British Prime Minister Tony Blair were also invited, but they declined the invitation.

And on previous anniversaries of the Fulton speech, many world leaders and politicians gathered at Westminster College, including former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and former Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev. We may see the last

| Igor Shumeiko

more. After all, what a cool slogan for his advertising campaign: "Hot pizza will help even in the cold war!!!" I give Mikhail Sergeevich.

For the anniversary, the Fulton exposition was updated and the Memorial and Churchill Library were redesigned at a cost of \$4 million. In addition, the symbolic beginning of the global confrontation was marked by a special service in St. Mary's Church on the territory of Westminster College.

So: why Churchill (then a retired goat drummer)? Why Fulton (the backwoods is utter)?

Anatoly Utkin wrote an excellent book about Churchill. It will be very amusing to quote his down-to-earth "version of Fulton". Before reproducing "Selected passages from a speech..." by Sir Winston, and answers to Churchill (and the world) by Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin in the newspaper "Pravda".

We quote Utkin: "Fellow countrymen from Missouri began to come to President Harry Truman, who was proud of his simplicity and accessibility, with simple requests. In January 1946, they asked for a senator to be sent to open a run-of-the-mill college in the Missouri town of Fulton. A patriot of his homeland, President Truman reacted unexpectedly: "Why should we ask tongue-tied senators when the biggest Chrysostom of the Anglo-Saxon world, retired Prime Minister Winston Churchill, is resting in Florida?" Churchill responded to the request, putting forward only one condition: "I will speak if the President of the United States is present in the hall." Truman agreed.

Churchill's infamous speech at Fulton corresponded with the mood of the right-wing forces in the USA, who had decided to "sort things out" with the East. "Fraternal Association of English-speaking Peoples". about which the ex-premier spoke, was supposed to become a military alliance, because, as Churchill argued, "nothing about the Russians

World War II. Reboot

makes more impression. than strength." This was the beginning of the tragic path of the arms race.

Another historian, Valentin Falin, describes the "state at the moment..."

"At the final stage of the war, the USSR did not pose a threat to the" free world ">. "Moscow had somewhat different concerns. It was necessary to raise the country from the ruins, and not dream of quasi-communist expansion. It is an established, proven fact that neither in 1945 nor in 1946 did the Soviet leadership intend to reproduce in Central and Eastern Europe models of an economic, social and political structure akin to Stalinism."

This was understood in the USA. Thus, in April 1946, General Clay, as deputy to the American governor of Germany, reported to the State Department: Soviet representatives on the Control Council "cannot be reproached for violating the Potsdam agreements." On the contrary, "they are doing them in the highest degree of conscientiousness," demonstrating "a sincere desire to be friends with us, as well as respect for the United States." "We," Clay concluded, "did not for a moment believe in the possibility of the upcoming Soviet aggression, and we do not believe it now."

However, Truman, who needed to sanctify the Rah Ategsapa doctrine, was not convinced by these considerations. It was precisely in order to somehow substantiate the claim for world hegemony that the United States needed Churchill. In favor of Churchill, from the point of view of Troumzna. said that during the war no one did more than Churchill in order to emasculate

military cooperation between the Western powers and the Soviet Union, to prevent real coordination of the actions of the armed forces of the three powers. disrupt the organization of the Second Front in 1942-1943 and thereby drag out the war, watching with Olympian calm how Germans and Russians bleed each other out in fierce battles. This is the meaning

288 Igor Shumeiko

The concept of the British Prime Minister echoed the approaches of Truman, who in June 1941 said: "If the Germans win, it's worth helping the Russians, if the Russians take over, help the Germans, and let them kill each other as much as possible."

"Unthinkable" and inevitable

Not later than March 1945, Churchill gave the order to collect captured German weapons and store them for possible use against the USSR. At the same time, they were ordered to develop Operation Unthinkable - a plan for a war against the Soviet Union, which was to begin | July 1945, with the forces of 112-113 divisions, including a dozen Wehrmacht divisions, which surrendered to the British and were transferred undisbanded to camps in Schleswig-Holstein and South Denmark. There they were kept ready until the spring of 1946.

Churchill made a lot of effort to involve in the "Unthinkable" Truman, who assumed the presidency after the death (April 12, 1945) of Franklin Roosevelt. "If it weren't for the categorical affront of the leading US military leaders, Churchill's The Unthinkable could have taken on the ominous features of the quite real and conceivable. It is even possible that with nuclear

accent.

On May 19, 1945, US Assistant Secretary of State Grew sent a memorandum to Truman stating that "if there is anything in the world that is inevitable, then war between the United States and the Soviet Union is that inevitable." "It is much better and more certain to have a collision before Russia can carry out reconstruction work and develop its huge potential of military, economic and territorial power," the document stated.

On the ideological basis expressed in Gru's memorandum, in essence, there was a dismantling of the political legacy of Ruz

World War II. Reboot

Welt, including in terms of the fulfillment (or dumping) of US obligations under: the Tehran and Yalta agreements. In parallel, a new military doctrine of the United States was being prepared at full speed. Her midwife was the successful nuclear test in Nevada.

And now directly ... Sir Winston Churchill. Fulton. Missouri, March 5, 1946 (Translated by Igor Zainetdinov.)

"I was delighted to arrive at Westminster College this afternoon and receive congratulations on my degree.

The name Westminster is somehow familiar to me. I seem to have heard it before. At another Westminster I received most of my education in politics, dialectic, rhetoric and other things. In fact, they are sister institutions.

(Joke. Playing on the name of the college and the district of Westminster, where the royal residence, Parliament and many government institutions are located.)

— The President told you that it is his desire, and I am sure that it is yours, that I give my true and correct assessment of this troubled and difficult time. I will of course use

this freedom, and I feel that I have the right to do so, because any private ambitions, any wild dreams that I cherished in my younger years, in short, have come true.

(There is an anecdote with the words of a gentleman lying in a plate of black caviar: "Life is good").

"Let me, however, make it clear that I have no official mission or status of any kind, and speak only for myself. I am nobody else

Igor Shumeiko

like yourself. I can therefore, relying on my life experience, allow myself to express my opinion on the problems that surround us on the day after our absolute victory, and try to make sure that the strength that was obtained at the cost of many sacrifices and sufferings must be preserved for the future glory and safety of mankind.

The United States now stands at the pinnacle of world power. This is a solemn moment for American democracy. This power must be combined with a strong responsibility for the future. If you look around you, you should feel not only a sense of accomplishment, but also anxiety, fear not to lose what you have achieved.

And here I am speaking especially of the myriad homes or families in which the wage-earner struggles against the problems and hardships of life, guards the wife and children from want and deprivation, and instills in the family the fear of God, as well as other ethical concepts, of great importance.

To ensure the safety of these countless homes and families, it is necessary to protect them from two giant marauders: war and tyranny.

The terrible ruin of Europe, with all its vanishing beauty, and most of Asia, stands in our eyes.

It is impossible to calculate what I call "Ve ipezltaiai zit oyo piapram" - "the inestimable sum of human pain." Our highest task and duty is to protect all people from the horrors and scourges of a new war.

A world organization created for the main purpose of preventing war, the United Nations, the successor to the League of Nations, with the decisive addition of the United States and all that it means, is already in operation.

There are, however, a certain practical suggestion. Courts and judges may be created, but they cannot function without sheriffs and constables. Organiza

World War II. Reboot 291

The United Nations should be immediately equipped with international armed forces.

I suggest that each state contribute a certain number of aviation squadrons to the service of the world organization. These units would be trained and trained in their own country, but moved from one country to another. They would wear the uniforms of their own countries, but with different badges. They would not be required to act against their own nation, but would otherwise be subject to the world organization.

I desired to see this done after the First World War, and I honestly believe so. What is this can be done immediately.

It would, however, be wrong and imprudent to hand over the secret knowledge or experience of the atomic bomb which the United States, Great Britain and Canada have to an organization which

all in infancy. People of all countries sleep peacefully in their beds because much of this knowledge and experience is in American hands.

I don't think that we would sleep so soundly if we had the opposite situation, when this lethal factor was monopolized by some communist or neo-fascist states. This circumstance would be used by them to impose totalitarian systems on the free democratic world, with dire consequences. God knows that this should not happen, and we have at least some time to strengthen our house before we face this danger, and even when no effort will help, we still have to have a huge superiority in order to use it as a deterrent."

In principle, Churchill declared an interesting, even philosophical topic - the presence of a superweapon and calmness

Igor Shumeiko

people - how do they compare? Since 1945, the atomic bomb has occupied a place in the mind that had been vacant since the days of ancient belief in myths. The miracle weapon, the Spear of Wotan, the Ring of the Nibelung, in essence, is a magic wand of military use. It's a pity, but Churchill gives only two versions of the situation: the current one (the US has the bomb) and... a hypothetical one, when... some communist or neo-fascist states would have a monopoly on the bomb.

But, strictly speaking, there are three options for a miracle bomb: 1) only the enemy, 2) only you, 3) both have a bomb. This classification of psychological states enables me to notice a paradoxical fact. Previously, for some reason, they did not pay attention to him. Most of all, the USA was in a state of fear - just in period No. 2. It was when they monopolized the Wonder Weapon. At that time, in the late forties, the fear of the Americans was growing, and as a result, it caused what they, in general, are still ashamed of - McCarthyism, the witch hunt. In the USSR, the first test of an atomic bomb took place in 1949. And it was hardly possible to create a more or less threatening nuclear arsenal and means of delivery by 1953.

Churchill: "Ultimately, when the necessary brotherhood of man is faithfully realized and embodied in a world organization with all the necessary practical guarantees to make it effective, these powers would, of course, be vested in a world organ.

downgrading".

This is the most interesting Churchill passage. Consider. In fact, this is an agreement: first (in the morning) - the necessary brotherhood of people, then (in the evening) - we will give the UN bomb. And what is especially interesting is that no one has yet asked the question! I'll ask it then, exactly, it turns out, on the 60th anniversary of the Fulton speech:

World War II. Reboot

"If ... the necessary brotherhood of man is truly realized and embodied in a world organization with all the necessary practical guarantees, why then the Bomb to such a "brotherhood of man"?

What I would really like for this book to come out is for some Western political scientist to answer this question.

In the meantime, my version: the necessary brotherhood of people - you, gentlemen, understood as the achievement of your control over the UN. Then you can provide the Bomb.

And after all, in principle, the Bomb, at that time - yours, you have the right to give it or not to give it. Or give, but only to a controlled organization. The condition can even be recognized as fair! BUT... — a highly characteristic slip of the tongue!!! — this state of control is called the "necessary brotherhood of man."

And indeed, with the slogan of accountability, you will not come to a foreign country to distribute grants, nurture the opposition, control, finance one election or cancel the results of others, feed the selected media, or establish international tribunals. As... "the necessary brotherhood of man"? (...)

Churchill: "Now I come to the second danger of those that threaten the home and ordinary people, namely, tyranny. We cannot be blind to the fact that the privileges enjoyed by every citizen of the British Empire do not hold true in a significant number of countries, some of which are very powerful. In these countries, the control of people is carried out by omnipotent police departments.

It is not our duty at this time, when there are so many difficulties, to interfere forcibly in the internal affairs of countries that we did not win in the war. But we must not stop fearlessly preaching the great principles of freedom and human rights that are
achieve

Igor Shumeiko

the English-speaking world and which, through Mapa Sapa, the Bill of Rights, the Nabea\$ Sogriz, the 1a1 yu diu, and the English common law, find their best-known expression in the American Declaration of Independence.

Freedom should be in every home. Here is the message of the British and American people to Mankind. Allow us to preach what we practice and practice what we preach.

I often quote words that I heard 50 years ago from a great Irish-American speaker, my friend, Boigke CosKhap: "There is enough for everyone. Earth is a generous mother; she will provide enough food for all her children if they work her soil legally and in peace."

Eh, I would like to know what the respected Voi! GKe SosKgap talked about oil ...

"Neither confidence in the prevention of war, nor a continuous rise in the level of world organization will be obtained without the fraternal association of the English-speaking peoples. This means a special relationship between the British Commonwealth of Nations and the USA. As I continue to discuss the method of implementing our full strategic concept, I am at a loss as to why I came here and what I am talking about here."

This fragment intonation reminds me of the woeful exclamation-questioning of the Emperor Tiberius, which is surely familiar to Churchill: "How can I write to you, fathers-senators, what to write, and what not to write yet? May I die the worst of deaths, if I know it..."

"There is, however, an important question that we must ask. Will there be a special relationship between the United States and the British Commonwealth of Nations at odds with loyalty to the World Organization? I reply that, on the contrary, this is probably the only means

World War II. Reboot

for the organization to reach its full height and strength. An example of this is the special relationship between the United States and the Canal, which I have just mentioned, and also the special relationship between the United States and the South American republics. We British have for 20 years had an agreement on cooperation and mutual assistance with Soviet Russia.

I agree with Mr. Bevin, British Foreign Secretary, that we are interested in an agreement for 50 years. We strive for mutual assistance and cooperation. The British have

an alliance with Portugal, unbroken since 1384, which had fruitful results at critical moments in the last war.

The Dark Ages may return, the Stone Age may return on the glittering wings of science, and what might now be a shower of immeasurable material wealth for humanity may bring utter destruction."

Well, let's recognize here the wonderful image of Churchill: the Stone Age can return on the sparkling wings of science.

"Beware, I say: time may be short. Don't let yourself drift through life until it's too late. If there is any fraternal association such as I have described, with all the extra strength and security that both our countries can guarantee, make sure that this great fact is known to the world and that it contributes to the stabilization of the foundations of the world. There is a path of wisdom. Prevention is better than cure."

But this is just pure Gogol. His parting words to youth from "Dead Souls": "Take with you on the road, leaving the soft youthful years in the harsh hardening courage, take with you all human movements, do not leave them on the road, do not pick them up later."

An interesting coincidence, probably speaking about the unity of human nature.

Igor Shumeiko

"A shadow has fallen on the scene, recently illuminated by the victory of the Allies. No one knows what Soviet Russia and the communist international organization intend to do in the immediate future, or what are the limits of their expansion and proselytizing tendencies. I have great admiration and respect for the brave Russian people and for my comrade-in-arms, Marshal Stalin. There is deep sympathy and benevolence in England—I do not doubt it—for all the Russian people, and the resolve to persevere, in spite of many differences and problems, to establish a long friendship. We understand Russia's need for the security of her western borders by removing all possibility of German aggression. We welcome Russia to her rightful place among the leading nations of the world. We salute her flag on the seas.

...however, I am sure that you would like me to present the facts, as I see them, about the present situation in Europe.

From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain stretched across the continent. On the other side of the imaginary line are all the capitals of the ancient states of Central and Eastern Europe. Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgral, Bucharest and Sofia, all these famous cities and settlements around them are in what I must call the Soviet sphere, and everything is subordinated, in one form or another, not only to Soviet influence, but to very strong and, in many cases, extremely strong control of Moscow."

So this historical iron curtain appears. It must be admitted that our "political observers" were inaccurate when they explained to us that in Fulton "Churchill pulled" him. We have received the original text of the speech only now, and we see that Churchill states rather than calls. And the question is: is it necessary to refute, otbrehivatsya on each item? "No, the Americans themselves fenced themselves off from us"

World War II. Reboot 207

After all, if we also remember the section of this "curtain" made in another material — reinforced concrete (Berlin Wall) — then, of course, we admit that the "curtain" is our work. And what was there to hide? The installation of the curtain is a defensive action, and if we also recall Stalin's painful reflections on the arrangement of the resulting sphere of influence ("without theory, we will perish"), then the tragedy is presented in a completely different light. Here are the allies and all of Europe

recognized the right of the USSR to the security belt. The right of the USSR to ensure the establishment of loyal, friendly governments there.

Because the former states, built on enmity, fulfilled the role of a "cordon sanitaire" in one direction, isolating the USSR. On the other hand, for aggression from the West to the East, they, on the contrary, acted as a springboard. No one knows exactly in what terms Stalin outlined this problem at Yalta, but here is the result: the USSR received the right to influence on this side of the Szczecin-Trieste line. Simply because the Versailles structures built after the First World War collapsed uniquely quickly and shamefully.

How to combine "loyalty" and economic mobility of the governments of "their own zone"? This is really the question.

"The Russian-controlled Polish government has been encouraged to make big and unwarranted attacks on Germany, and mass expulsions of millions of Germans on a sad and unimaginable scale are now taking place. communist parties. which were very small in all the Eastern states of Europe, seized power everywhere and gained unlimited totalitarian control. Police governments predominate in almost every case, and so far, apart from Czechoslovakia, there is no true democracy anywhere."

Well, here Stalin perfectly answered (see below).

Igor Shumeiko

"Turkey and Persia are also deeply alarmed and concerned about the demands that the Moscow government is making of them. The Russians made an attempt in Berlin to create a quasi-communist party in their zone of German occupation, especially supporting a group of German left leaders.

If the Soviet government now attempts to separately create a pro-communist Germany in their zone, this will cause new serious difficulties in the British and American zones and will divide the defeated Germans between the Soviets and the Western democracies.

Yes, the USSR made "demands". As well as England - the USA. But it would be interesting today to ask Turkey, and at the same time Iraq (Persia): whose demands for them were more moderate, reasonable? True, you can only ask the Turks. Since the recent demands of the heirs of Churchill and Truman to Iraq turned out, as they say in the minutes, "incompatible with the life (of the country)".

"Any conclusion can be drawn from these facts, and the facts are this: this, of course, is not the liberated Europe for which we fought. This is not what is needed for permanent peace.

The security of the world requires a new unity in Europe, from which no nation must stand aloof. Because of the quarrels between the strong races in Europe, all wars took place, both in the past and the world war that we have witnessed. And as far as the Iron Curtain that lies across Europe, there are many reasons for concern.

Serious difficulties are caused in Italy by the Communist Party by supporting the demands of the communist retinue (rump) of Marshal Tito to change the Italian territory in the Adriatic. However, Italy's future is in balance.

World War II. Reboot

Again, one cannot imagine a restored Europe without a strong France. All my adult life I have worked for a strong France and I have never lost faith in her fate, even in her darkest hours. I won't lose faith now. However, in a large number of countries far from Russian

borders, and all over the world communist fifth columns are destabilizing and working in complete unity and absolute obedience to the orders they receive from the communist centre. In addition, in the British Commonwealth and in the United States, where communism is still in its infancy, communist parties or fifth columns constitute a growing challenge and danger to Christian civilization.

The prospect in the Far East and especially in Manchuria is also worrying. Agreement, which was signed at Yalta, in which I was involved, was extremely favorable to Soviet Russia, but it happened at a time when no one could say that the German war would last all summer and autumn [1945- and that the Japanese War was expected to continue for another 18 months after the end of the German war. In this country, you are all so well informed about the Far East and such devoted friends of China that there is no need to rant further on this subject.

Just in case, he apologizes for giving away a lot in Yalta. Explains the ongoing war.

"I felt obliged to depict the shadow that, both in the West and in the East, falls on the world. I was a high minister at the time of the Versailles agreement and a close friend of Lloyd George, who was head of the British delegation at Versailles. I myself did not agree with many things that I saw. but I have a very strong impression of this situation, and I find it painful to compare it with what prevails

Igor Shumeiko

Now. In those days there were high hopes and boundless certainty that the wars were over and that the League of Nations had become all-powerful. I do not see or feel the same certainty or even the same hopes in a tormented world at this time. On the other hand, I am more of the opinion that war is coming than that it is inevitable.

I am sure that our fate is still in our own hands and that it is in our power to save the future, that I feel it is my duty to speak of it whenever I have the opportunity and opportunity to do so. I do not believe that Soviet Russia wants war. That their desires are the fruits of war and the indefinite expansion of their power and doctrine. But what we must consider today, while there is still time, is the permanent prevention of war and the establishment of the conditions of freedom and democracy as quickly as possible in all countries. Our difficulties and dangers will not disappear if we close our eyes to them. They will not disappear simply by waiting for what is to happen; and will not be removed by the appeasement policy. A settlement is needed, and the longer this is delayed, the more difficult it will be and the greater the danger.

Because I saw our Russian friends and allies during the war, I am convinced that there is nothing they admire more than strength, and there is nothing that they respect less than weakness, especially military weakness. But for this reason the old doctrine of the balance of power is not justified.

If Western democracies stand together in strict observance of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, their influence in promoting those principles will be enormous, and no one will be able to interfere with them.

If, however, they are divided or waver in the performance of their duties, and if these important years pass in vain, then indeed, a catastrophe may overwhelm us all.

World War II. Reboot

The last time I saw this and shouted loudly to my countrymen and the world; no one paid attention. Until 1933, or even 1935, Germany could have been saved from the terrible fate that befell her, and we could all have been saved from the disasters that Hitler brought to free humanity. There has never been a war in history that was easier to prevent.

timely action than the one that has just devastated such large areas of the globe.

This could have been prevented, in my deep conviction, without firing a shot, and Germany could have been powerful, prosperous and great today; but no one listened, and one by one we were all sucked into a terrible whirlpool.

And here Churchill is not a "rabid enemy", but a really valuable, most valuable witness. If they say that it was easy to keep Hitler at any of the frontiers of 1933-1938, then, of course, he is right. That is why such an "Aiti-Munichian" fuse in the relevant chapters of this book ... And spit once again in the eyes of Bukovsky-Rezun-Korotich and others! Their bulging of the Soviet-German pact of 1939 is the dirtiest mercenary.

"We certainly must not let this happen again. Only now, in 1946, can a good understanding be reached on all points with Russia under the common authority of the United Nations, and this good understanding can be maintained after many years of peace, in accordance with the world instrument. supported by all the strength of the English-speaking world and all its entities".

And after Churchill's Fulton speech, let's move on to the answers of I.V. Stalin.

Zee Igor Shumeiko

ANSWERS I.V. Stalin TO THE CORRESPONDENT OF "PRAVDA"

"The other day, one of the Pravda correspondents turned to Comrade Stalin with a request to clarify a number of issues related to Mr. Churchill's speech. Comrade Stalin gave the appropriate explanations, which are given below in the form of answers to the correspondent's questions.

Question. How do you assess Mr. Churchill's last speech in the United States of America?

Answer. I regard it as a dangerous act calculated to sow the seeds of discord among the Allied States and hinder their cooperation.

Question. Can it be considered that Mr. Churchill's speech is detrimental to the cause of peace and security?

Answer. Certainly yes. As a matter of fact, Mr. Churchill is now in the position of warmongers. And Mr. Churchill is not alone here—he has friends not only in England, but also in the United States of America.

It should be noted that Mr. Churchill and his friends are strikingly reminiscent of Hitler and his friends in this respect. Hitler began the business of starting the war by proclaiming the racial theory, declaring that only people who spoke German constituted a complete nation. Mr. Churchill begins the work of unleashing war also with racial theory. arguing that only the nations that speak the English language are full-fledged nations, called to decide the fate of the whole world. German racial theory led Hitler and his friends to the conclusion that Germans, as the only sex

World War II. Reboot

a valuable nation must dominate other nations. The English racial theory will lead Mr. Churchill and his friends to the conclusion that the nations that speak the English language, as the only sound ones, should dominate the rest of the nations of the world.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Churchill and his friends in England and the USA present to the non-English-speaking nations something like an ultimatum: accept our domination voluntarily, and then everything will be in order - otherwise war is inevitable.

But the nations shed their blood during five years of brutal war for the freedom and independence of their countries, and not to replace the rule of the Hitlers with the rule of the Churchills. That's quite likely why. that nations that do not speak English, and yet constitute the vast majority of the world's population, will not agree to go into a new slavery.

The tragedy of Mr. Churchill is that he, as an inveterate Tory, does not understand this simple and obvious truth.

There is no doubt that Mr. Churchill's directive is a directive for war, a call for war with the USSR. It is also clear that such an attitude of Mr. Churchill is incompatible with the existing treaty of alliance between Britain and the USSR. True, Mr. Churchill, in order to confuse readers, casually states that the term of the Soviet-British treaty on mutual assistance and cooperation could well be extended to 50 years. But how can such a statement by Mr. Churchill be reconciled with his attitude towards war with the USSR, with his preaching of war against the USSR? It is clear that these things cannot be combined in any way. And if Mr. Churchill, who calls for war with the Soviet Union, at the same time considers it possible to extend the term of the Anglo-Soviet treaty to 50 years, this means that he regards this treaty as an empty piece of paper,

Igor Shumeiko

he needs only to cover up and disguise his anti-Soviet attitude. Therefore, one cannot take seriously the false statements of Mr. Churchill's friends in England about extending the term of the Soviet-British treaty to 50 years or more. Extending the term of the contract does not make sense if one of the parties violates the contract and turns it into an empty piece of paper.

Question. How do you assess that part of Mr. Churchill's speech where he attacks the democratic system of the European states neighboring us and where he criticizes the good neighborly relations established between these states and the Soviet Union?

Answer. This part of Mr. Churchill's speech is a mixture of elements of slander with elements of rudeness and tactlessness.

Mr. Churchill asserts that "Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest, Sofia – all these famous cities and the population in their areas are in the Soviet sphere and all are subject in one form or another not only to the Soviet influence, but also largely increasing control of Moscow". Mr. Churchill qualifies all this as the limitless "expansionist tendencies" of the Soviet Union.

It does not take much effort to show that Mr. Churchill is here rudely and shamelessly slandering both Moscow and the named states neighboring the USSR.

In the first place, it is absolutely absurd to speak of the exclusive control of the USSR in Vienna and Berlin, where there are Allied Control Councils composed of representatives of four states and where the USSR has only 1/3 of the votes. It happens that other people cannot but slander, but it is still necessary to know when to stop.

World War II. Reboot

Stalin does not miss an opportunity to catch Churchill on a few private mistakes. Churchill talks about the total control of the USSR on the other side of the "curtain", and Stalin recalls: there are also the western parts of Berlin and Vienna. But it is clear that it is not a matter of catching Churchill on these

almost reservations. The real, poignant question: Organizing the lives of tens of millions within your sphere of influence. In the absence of even the slightest bit of the experience, set of ideas, techniques that the former allies have. Here is the most colossal advantage of Churchill. And Bomba? What is bomb? In three years there will be a bomb (Kurchatov is an honest and capable person)...

Stalin, literally in the next paragraph, explains the essence of the issue: the colossal sacrifices of the Soviet people, which ensured the liberation of Europe from the Nazi yoke. The Soviet Union cannot forget about them. ... wanting to secure himself for the future, is trying to ensure that in these countries there are governments that are loyal to the Soviet Union?

But how to combine loyalty and sustainability? To provide a field of safety for the "heroic people" before they fell into the "heroic dream", as after the First Patriotic War?

"Secondly, we must not forget the following circumstance. The Germans invaded the USSR through Finland, Poland, Romania and Hungary. The Germans were able to invade through these countries because in these countries there were then governments hostile to the Soviet Union. As a result of the German invasion, the Soviet Union irretrievably lost about seven million people in battles with the Germans, as well as due to the German occupation and the deportation of Soviet people to German penal servitude. In other words. The Soviet Union lost several times more people. than England and the United States of America combined. It is possible that in some places they are inclined to consign to oblivion these colossal victims of the Soviet

Igor Shumeiko

people who ensured the liberation of Europe from the Nazi yoke. But the Soviet Union cannot forget about them. Asked. what can be surprising in the fact that the Soviet Union, wishing to secure itself for the future, is trying to ensure that in these countries there are governments loyal to the Soviet Union? How can one, without being crazy, qualify these peaceful aspirations of the Soviet Union as the expansionist tendencies of our state?

Mr. Churchill asserts that "the Polish government. being under Russian domination, succumbed to huge and unjust encroachments on Germany.

Every word here is gross and insulting slander. Modern democratic Poland is led by outstanding people. They proved in practice that they are able to protect the interests and dignity of the motherland in a way that their predecessors were not able to do. What grounds does Mr. Churchill have for asserting that the leaders of present-day Poland can allow the "domination" of representatives of any foreign states in their country? Is it not because Mr. Churchill is slandering the "Russians" here because he intends to sow the seeds of discord in relations between Poland and the Soviet Union?..."

Once again Churchill was caught - the western borders of Poland were agreed upon at Yalta and Potsdam.

"Mr. Churchill is unhappy that Poland has made a turn in its policy towards friendship and alliance with the USSR. There was a time when elements of conflicts and contradictions prevailed in relations between Poland and the USSR. This circumstance made it possible for statesmen like Mr. Churchill to play on these contradictions, to pick up Poland.

TO

World War II. Reboot MR

under the guise of protection from the Russians, to intimidate Russia with the specter of a war between her and Poland and retain the position of an arbiter. But that time has passed. for the enmity between Poland and Russia has given way to friendship between them, and Poland, modern democratic Poland, no longer wishes to be a playing ball in the hands of foreigners. It seems to me that this is exactly

circumstance irritates Mr. Churchill and pushes him towards the rude, tactless antics against Poland. Is it a joke to say: they don't let him play at someone else's expense ...

As for Mr. Churchill's attacks on the Soviet Union in connection with the expansion of the western borders of the Polish territories seized by the Germans in the past, here, it seems to me, he is clearly distorting the cards. As is known, the decision on Poland's western borders was made at the Berlin Conference of the Three Powers on the basis of Poland's demands. The Soviet Union has repeatedly stated that it considers Poland's demands correct and just. It is quite probable that Mr. Churchill is dissatisfied with this decision. But why does Mr. Churchill, sparing no arrows against the position of the Russians on this question, conceal from his readers the fact that the decision was taken at the Berlin Conference unanimously, that not only the Russians, but also the British and Americans voted for the decision? - cants? Why did Mr. Churchill need to mislead people?

Mr. Churchill goes on to say that "the communist parties, which were very insignificant in all these eastern states of Europe, have attained an exceptional strength, far outnumbering them, and are striving to establish totalitarian control everywhere, police governments prevail almost in all these countries, and up to the present time, with the exception of Czechoslovakia, there is no genuine democracy in them."

Igor Shumeiko

"As you know, in England today one party governs the state, the Labor Party, and the opposition parties are deprived of the right to participate in the government of England. This is what Mr. Churchill calls true democracy. In Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Hungary, a bloc of several parties, from four to six parties, rules, and the opposition, if it is more or less loyal, is guaranteed the right to participate in the government. This is what Mr. Churchill calls totalitarianism, tyranny, policemanship. Why, on what basis - do not expect an answer from Mr. Churchill. Mr. Churchill does not understand what a ridiculous position he puts himself in with his noisy speeches about totalitarianism, tyranny, police."

Mr. Churchill would like Poland to be ruled by Sosnkowski and Anders, Yugoslavia by Mikhailovich and Pavelic, Rumania by Prince Stirbey and Radescu, Hungary and Austria by some king from the house of Habsburg, and so on. Mr. Churchill wants to assure us that these gentlemen from the fascist backyard can ensure "genuine democracy." Such is the "democratism" of Mr. Churchill.

Mr. Churchill wanders about the truth when he speaks of the growth of the influence of the communist parties in Eastern Europe. However, it should be noted that it is not entirely accurate. The influence of communist parties grew not only in Eastern Europe, but in almost all countries of Europe where fascism had previously dominated (Italy, Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria, Finland) or where there had been a German, Italian or Hungarian occupation (France), Belgium, Holland, Norway, Denmark, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Greece, the Soviet Union, etc.).

The growth of communist influence cannot be considered an accident. It represents a completely natural phenomenon. The influence of the communists grew because in the difficult years of the domination of fascism in Europe, the communists found themselves on

World War II. Reboot

reliable, courageous, selfless fighters against the fascist regime, for the freedom of peoples. Mr. Churchill sometimes refers in his speeches to "ordinary people from small houses", patting them on the shoulder like a gentleman and pretending to be their friend. But these people are not as simple as it might seem at first glance. They, the "ordinary people", have their own views, their own policies, and they know how to stand up for themselves. It is they, the millions of these "common people", who voted Mr. Churchill and his party in England, giving their votes to the Laborites. It is they, the millions of these "ordinary people", who isolated the reactionaries, supporters of

cooperation with fascism and gave preference to left-wing democratic parties. It is they, millions of these "ordinary people", having tested the communists in the fire of struggle and resistance to fascism, they decided that the communists fully deserve the trust of the people. This is how the influence of the communists in Europe grew. Such is the law of historical development. ,

Of course, Mr. Churchill does not like this development of events, and he sounds the alarm, appealing to force. But he also disliked the emergence of the Soviet regime in Russia after World War I. He also sounded the alarm then and organized a military campaign with the goal of turning back the wheel of history. "14 States" v. Russia, But history turned out to be stronger than Churchill's intervention, and Mr. Churchill's quixotic habits led to the fact that he then suffered a complete defeat. I do not know if Mr. Churchill and his friends will be able to organize a new campaign against Eastern Europe after the Second World War. But if they succeed—which is unlikely, since millions of "ordinary people" stand guard over the cause of peace—then it can be said with certainty that they will be beaten just as they were beaten in the past, 26 years ago.

Is it true. March 14, 1946".

Igor Shumeiko

Conclusions. The summation of everything said and measured.

Yes, we will not go anywhere from the "Big War". The one that, according to Bruce Catton, takes command herself. World War II was just that. Recognizing the version of the "Correct World War" that started on 1 September 1939 means receiving an eternal stream of claims for the Baltic states, etc., for "acts of aggression in peacetime". Claims from those who themselves have already waged a war and have even managed to cross "to the other side" and who are building up this side, some with Austria, some with Klaipeda-Memel, some with Czechoslovakia.

The version of the "Great War", a war outside of any pacts, outside of "Declaring oneself from such and such an hour, such a date in a state ..." reveals the true scope of the War. It expands the time frame, or rather, simply removes the lower one from THESE "frames". "Great War", forgive me this half-citation of the Gospel: "... does not come in a noticeable way."

And today, the version of the "Big War" returns "to the front line" some of the participants, reminding them on which side they acted ...

Application

Geopolitics and all that ... (Preparation, nature and geopolitical consequences of the Second World War - in 50 5M5 \$-kah.)

The dual experience of doing RT and teaching at the same university tells me that I need to take care of the shortest version of the story offered in this book. Today, both the Consumer and the Student require summary. And not just short, but also peculiarly pulsating. And, if you want to be perceived, you must somehow rhythmically correspond to the modern informational style: "The future depends on you", "Control the dream", etc.

Therefore, the entire content of this book is presented in the form of 50 slogans, short theses, available, including for communication in the 5M format.

1. Adolf Hitler - trust manager of CJSC Europe.
2. How many days did the Škoda and ČKD factories stand idle due to the change of the flag in 1938?
3. Before the Soviet tanks of 1968 in Prague, there were Czech tanks in Minsk, Smolensk and Stalingrad.

4. The moral responsibility of Shkodovites is like their tanks - "light and medium".

2 Igor Shumeiko

5. They were afraid that the drunken president-conductor would try himself as a tambour-major at the Victory Parade.

6. The French at 100 dollars per barrel will be invited to the Parade, as heroes of the Second Front, and Kuwait with the Emirates.

7. England was engaged in "dubious fleets", and the USSR - "dubious republics".

8. Strasbourg, Prague and Vilnius had to be liberated so that those wise men could settle there who would tell you according to what rules they should have been liberated and what fines are due for violation of these rules.

9. On the field of Borodino, our and French infantry are fiercely fighting for flushes, and nearby the cavalymen of Murat and Uvarov arrange joint concerts and presentations.

10. The German Kaiser was not "their son of a bitch", which means forward to the fore, liberals! "Long live the Weimar Republic And so it went.

11. On September 11-13, 2001, the "rogue state" was the United States of America.

12. The Russian children's team won the championship in Aryanism, and the youth team lost. (With the sole refereeing of the Fuhrer.)

13. We just need a different model for using Rezun. For example. A man releases a pig into a truffle field, the pig searches, tears off truffles, but this is where its "cooperation" ends. A person finds another use for the truffle, different from the desires of his grunting "colleague".

World War II. Reboot 312

14. The new Judas does not hang himself, but diligently adds to thirty yeshe and thirty-first, second, third ... pieces of silver - for "Memories of the Garden of Gethsemane."

And then another thirty-sixth, seventh - for "Corrections to Reminiscences".

15. And the preface to Lelokol was written by Bukovsky, if you remember this one. He was sent by barter to Israel.

16. The point is precisely in the absence of persons. In front of you is just ... talking (champing) dirt ...

17. "Churchill is a conformist!" In fact, it is difficult even to imagine anything more incompatible. (Like: "Kolobok Rezun ran not from the GRU, but from the Bolshoi Ballet.")

18. So, lovers of simple evidence: "A Short Course in the History of the CPSU (b)" and the British Prime Minister and historian Churchill are absolutely unanimous in their interpretation and assessment of the events of 1939 of the year".

19. Swedish "neutrality" turned out to be the best air defense of the Reich's supply routes.

20. The author seemed to be walking with a voice recorder through the streets of Berlin in the thirties.

21. Marabini testifies: in 1932, German Jews were more afraid of the Communists than of Hitler.

22. By the way, Ingvar Kamprad, later the founder of the worldwide IKRA network, also marched in Nordisk Ungdom (Northern Youth). (I have an idea!)

511 Igor Shumeiko

23. Ersatz beer was made on the basis of dairy production waste. Drinking it was, of course, the most difficult, perhaps unbearable test for the "Aryan spirit."

24. The most imaginable Resistance heroes are Keanu Reeves and his girlfriend in The Matrix.

25. Level of Hitlerian Violence: Possibly. there will still be a lot of attempts to even exaggerate it in order to hide behind it, to hide the share of completely mutually beneficial market relations.

26. Denmark, Norway, the Czech Republic, France received not only orders, but also orders.

27. It was in Buchenwald and Majdanek that shackles rang, and in "United Europe" coins rang.

28. "Munich" of the 15th century was in Constance. Jan Hus went to the church cathedral with guarantees of inviolability from Emperor Sigismund of Luxembourg. Chamberlain's guarantees have a rich background!

29. Defenestration, execution by throwing out of a window, is a Czech invention. Apparently, this is due to the success of multi-storey construction in Prague.

30. Previously, part of the Sudetes was called the Giant Mountains. Disputed national minority - "Giant Germans".

21. In March 1939, Poland will receive the highly developed Tieszyn District from the Czech heritage as an encouragement from Hitler, and literally six months later, in September, it will receive everything else due.

World War II. Reboot 315

32. The nation of Jan Hus and Georgy Podebrad was betrayed by Europe, holders of the Order of the Garter and Nobel Peace Prize winners.

33. "Fifth column" ... Doesn't it remind you of the "fifth corner"? As she was born on the pages of newspapers in 1937, she basically marched there.

34. The only successful Hitlerite "fifth column" ... was the Sudetenland. And that was only because she had such "column-drivers" as Chamberlain, Halifax, Daladier.

37. Among all the ideas, the one that has the brightest "video sequence" is selected. Beam passable but TV.

38. A replica of the hero is remembered. Or even the actor who played this character. Or even someone from the film crew.

39. US senators apologized for the slave trade, the Pope apologized for the Crusades. The Germans are for the Holocaust. Then - the dish is sent around - the Turks apologize for the year 1915, but we, of course, have more: for 1940, and for 1956, and for 1968...

40. The current president of tiny Macedonia apologizes to half the world for the campaigns of Alexander the Great. Tomorrow Tunisia will send its apologies to Italy "for the genocide at Cannae... and for the entire campaign of Hannibal" (the Bedouins are even flattered by their involvement in world history).

41. What if... and in Russia a politician turns up who will apologize, even half a New Year, how to send two bytes? So, with these apologies, you can get very real money - they are called "reparations".

Igor Shumeiko

42. The Lithuanian financial account for 1940 cannot be considered because it may be overstated. But because it means getting on a par with war criminals. Because this is a direct insult to our compatriots who won the Victory...

43. United Europa-! (Brussels) must recognize one simple historical fact — its continuity with the United Europe-1 (Berlin). Except, of course, the UK and Russia.

44. Norwegian sailors (and coastal forces) sink the German cruisers, and the air base surrenders to fighter crews. And then the whole capital "accepts the parade" of five landing companies. It looks more like the expedition of Cortes.

45. The German Georg Ohm taught us how to measure electrical resistance. How and how to measure the resistance to the Germans in World War II?

46. The Avenger is not yet the Protector. The Defender carries the Weapon openly. And it is possible to protect (shield, stand between the defended and the enemy) only openly. Revenge - whatever.

47. The Great War "does not come in a conspicuous way."

48. We return "to the front line" some participants, reminding them on which side they acted.

49. The fact that the military sins of the liberators will be remembered, but the benefits of liberation will be forgotten - this is quite in the nature of man.

50. It is impossible to operate with the results of the World War in terms of modern politically correct hangouts.

Notes

[Go to page 12](#)

Jacques Bergier was born in 1912. He studied at the Sorbonne and the Higher National School of Chemistry. Chemical engineer, candidate of sciences. From 1934 to 1939 he worked in the laboratory of Professor Andre Elbrunner on the problems of the influence of heavy water on nuclear processes. He synthesized polonium based on bismuth and "heavy hydrogen". From the beginning of the war, he fought in the Resistance troops. In 1944 he was arrested and exiled to the Mauthausen death camp. After his release, he was awarded the highest orders of France and many foreign orders, including Soviet ones, for major successes in the destruction of the German Fau on the island of Peenemünde. After the end of the war, he returned to scientific work. In 1947 he received a patent for electronic control of cooling in reactor processes. The last of the published scientific works concerns the mathematical analysis of a chain reaction with a mass of uranium that does not reach the critical one.

Elected to the New York Academy of Sciences. Founding member of the French Association of Science Writers. Author of eight books.

The Red Chapel is the common name for the Soviet intelligence network during World War II,

operating in European countries (Germany, Belgium, France, etc.).

The Black Chapel is a secret society organized by generals, diplomats, opponents of Hitler's actions.

[Go to page 15](#)

Austin Chamberlain — British statesman. recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1925. Born October 16, 1863 in Birmingham; Joseph Chamberlain's eldest son, Neville Chamberlain was a cousin.

[To page 22](#)

Ulmanis Karlis (1877–1942) — Latvian politician. Leader of the “Latvian Peasants' Union”. In 1918-1934 he repeatedly headed the government of the Republic of Latvia. In 1934 he carried out a coup d'état and established a personal dictatorship. Prime Minister (1936-1940), then President of Latvia, Repressed by the NKVD; died in prison.

[To page 41](#)

Chester William Nimitz (1885-1966) since 1942 the commander-in-chief of the American armed forces in the Pacific region, since 1945 - the Navy in the Pacific Ocean. Conducted several successful major operations against the Japanese armed forces. On behalf of the United States, he signed the act of surrender of Japan on May 2, 1945.

[To page 53](#)

John Keegan is an eminent British military historian and journalist, author of the book The Second World War\Twe Zesopa Wu no. 9 Mag. He believes that at the beginning of the twentieth! century, we live in a world affected by this war, that many of the modern crises were due to the decisions taken in 1939-1945.

World War II. Reboot

[To page 54](#)

Martin van Creveld is one of the world's foremost military theorists, professor of history at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, author of Warring Forces, Command in War and Transformation of War, which have had a great influence on modern military theory . The creator of a new theory of “non-trinitarian” war that develops Clausewitz’s positions, enjoys the reputation of “shaker of foundations”, “extremist”, “radical” and even “heretic” among his colleagues.

[To page 62](#)

Alexey Isaev is the author of the books “Anti-Suvors”, “Ten Myths of World War II”, “From Dubno to Rostov”, “1941; battles in Ukraine”, “Battle for Kharkov (February-March 1943)”, “A short course in the history of the Great Patriotic War. The Offensive of Marshal Shaposhnikov”, “When there was no more surprise”, “Boilers of 1941”, as well as articles in the magazine “Polygon”, the newspaper “Independent Military Review” and other works.

Andrey Zorin is a critic, publicist, author and compiler of the following books: “Having accomplished his feat...”, “Feeding the double-headed eagle”, “Flower garden. Russian light poetry of the end of the 18th - beginning of the 20th century.

[To page 70](#)

Heinrich Brüning (1885–1970) was a German politician. In the 1920-1930s, he held responsible positions in the Catholic Union of Trade Unions. In 1924 he was elected to the Reichstag, since 1929 the leader of the faction of the Center Party. He was closely associated with the Vatican. March 1930 - May 1932

Reichscanner. The Brüning government made extensive use of Art. 48 of the Weimar Constitution of 1919 in order to pass emergency anti-democratic laws, passed decrees on the reduction of wages for workers and employees, on the introduction of new taxes for workers,

Igor Shumeiko

persecuted anti-fascist workers' organizations and especially the Communist Party. His policy facilitated the establishment of an open fascist dictatorship in Germany. In 1934 Brüning emigrated to the United States.

To page 70

Franz von Papen (1879-1969) German politician and diplomat. Born December 29, 1879 in Werl (Westphalia) in the family of a large landowner. Before World War II he was an officer of the General Staff. In 1913-1915 he was a military attaché in the United States, from where he was expelled for espionage and subversive activities. In 1921-1932 he was a member of the Prussian Landtag from the Catholic Center Party; adjoined its extreme right wing.

In July-November 1932, he headed the government, which contributed to the strengthening of the position of the Nazis in Germany. He took an active part in the establishment of the Nazi dictatorship in January 1933 and entered Hitler's first cabinet as Vice-Chancellor. July 1934-March 1938 Ambassador to Austria; contributed to the implementation of the Anschluss. As ambassador to Turkey from 1939-1944, von Papen sought to draw her into the ranks of Germany's allies. In April 1945 he was arrested in the Ruhr by the military administration of the 9th US Army. In 1946, he appeared before the court of the International Military Tribunal in Nuremberg, but was acquitted. However, in February 1947, he again appeared before the denazification commission and was sentenced to 8 months in prison as a war criminal. Died May 2, 1969 in Obersasbach, Baden.

To page 70

Von Schleicher (1882-1934) - the last cannibal of the Weimar Republic. Born April 7, 1882 in Brandenburg in an old Prussian Junker family. In 1903 he joined the 3rd Guards Infantry Regiment under command

World War II. Reboot

by General Paul von Hindenburg. In 1913 he was invited with the rank of captain to the General Staff, where he worked during the 1st World War. He was a close friend of Oskar von Hindenburg. In 1918, von Schleicher became aide-de-camp to Chief Quartermaster Wilhelm Gröner. He took an active part in the creation of units of the "Volunteer Corps". In February 1926, von Schleicher became head of the land forces department of the Reichswehr ministry. In 1929, von Schleicher was promoted to the rank of major general. He held various government posts, including being the Minister of Defense. On December 3, 1932, succeeding the resigned Franz von Papen, von Schleicher became Reich Chancellor. His half-hearted attempts to combine the actions of the trade unions and the Reichswehr in order to stop the Nazis rushing to power came to nothing. As a result of behind-the-scenes political intrigues of the former Chancellor von Papen and Hitler, President Hindenburg accepted von Schleicher's resignation and on January 30, 1933, proclaimed Adolf Hitler chancellor. Hitler, who did not forget his tyulite opponent, brutally took revenge on von Schleicher during the events of the Night of the Long Knives. On June 30, 1934, several men broke into the retired Chancellor's villa, mortally wounded his wife and killed him, as was later reported, while attempting armed resistance.

To page 73

Gedin Anders Sven (1865-1952) — traveler, scientist, writer. From 1893 to 1902 he explored Tibet and the northwest of Central Asia. In 1895-1908, from Tranezund (Trabzon) through Northeastern Iran, Kashmir reached the headwaters of the Brahmaputra and Sutlej rivers.

discovered the Transhimalaya. In 1923 he made a round-the-world trip through North America. Japan, Mongolia and Siberia.

< Gua [1

Igor Shumeiko

In 1927-1935 he studied China, Mongolia, Western Tibet and Eastern Turkestan. In the last period of his life, he retired from research activities. During World War II, he collaborated with the Nazi authorities in Germany.

To page 74

Karina von Kantzow as Karina von Fock, daughter of a Swedish colonel, then wife of the Swedish aristocrat Count Nils von Kantzow. At the age of 32, she (already having a son) met in the house of her sister a hero-pilot from the Richthofen air force, 27-year-old captain Hermann Goering (in 1920)

To page 91 . Anthony Eden (1897-1977; from 1961 peer and first earl of Avon) - an outstanding British statesman, conservative, in 1935-1938 (Baldwin's cabinet), in 1940-1945 (Churchill's military government) Minister of Foreign Affairs , in 1955-1957 - Prime Minister of Great Britain.

To page 92

Reginald Drax - Master of the Horse of the King's Court, Commandant of the Port of Portsmouth, who had no influence in the British armed forces and no idea about the external
politics.

To page 98

John Maynard Keynes, Lord (1883-1946) - English economist, founder of the Keynesian trend in economic theory. President of the Econometric Society (1944-1945).

In the late 1920s and early 1930s, the US economy was hit by a deep crisis, the so-called Great Depression. The crisis has gripped not only the American economy -

World War II. Reboot 423

European countries were also affected by the crisis, with

than in Europe this crisis began even earlier than in the United States. The leaders and economists of the leading countries of the world were feverishly looking for ways out of the crisis. Such a way out was suggested to them by Keynes, who published in 1936 the book "The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money", which immediately became famous. The emerging economic trend is called Keynesianism. Seen as an alternative to Marxism.

To page 110

Sir Creebies Richard Stafford (1889-1952) was an English statesman and Labor politician. By profession a lawyer. Member of the House of Commons from 1931-1950. In the 30s. was one of the leaders of the left wing of the Labor Party; in 1934-1935 he was a member of the executive committee of the party. In the prewar years, Cripps was a supporter of repelling fascist aggression and strengthening collective security with the participation of the USSR. He advocated a united front of all leftist organizations, including the Communist Party, for which he was expelled from the Labor Party in January 1939. With the coming to power of the government of W. Churchill, Cripps was appointed ambassador to the USSR (he held this post in May 1940 - January 1942). On behalf of Great Britain, in July 1941, he signed an agreement with the USSR on joint actions in the war against Nazi Germany. In March 1942 he headed

special British mission to India. He was the leader of the House of Commons (1942), then Minister of the Aircraft Industry in the government of Churchill (1942-1945). In March 1945, he was reinstated in the Labor Party. He served as Minister of Trade (1945-1947), Minister of Economics (1947), Minister of Finance (1947-1950) in the Labor government of Cripps Attlee.

To p. 116 Liddell Hart (1895-1970) before being knighted, known as Captain B.G. Liddell Hart - English in

324 Igor Shumeiko

An important historian and theorist who had a great influence on the development of mechanized warfare in the 20th century, as well as on the theory of strategy in general. He began using his mother's maiden name Liddell as part of his last name from 1921. He began publishing his theories in the 1920s in the popular press and subsequently discovered that his or similar developments were the basis of Nazi Germany's blitzkrieg tactics.

To page 116

Halifax (Halifax) Edward Frederick Wood (1881-1969) English statesman. In 1910 he was elected to Parliament from the Conservative Party. In 1922-1924 and 1932-1935 Minister of Education, in 1924-1925 Minister of Agriculture. 1926-1931 Viceroy of India; He combined repressions against the national liberation movement with constitutional maneuvers to strengthen British rule. From 1935-1937 Lord Privy Seal, from 1935-1938 Leader of the House of Lords and Deputy. prime minister. In 1938-1940 Minister of Foreign Affairs; supporter of the appeasement of the fascist aggressors. In November 1937, he negotiated with A. Hitler, during which he outlined the program of Anglo-German cooperation. From 1941-1946 he was Ambassador to the United States. From 1947-1953 he was Chairman of the General Advisory Board of the BBC Broadcasting Company.

To page [17

Franz Halder (1884-1972) - Colonel General (7/19/1940) of the German army. Chief of the General Staff of the Ground Forces in 1938-1942. Military figure. From a military family, the son of a major general. He received his education at the Bavarian military school. In 1902 he joined Her Majesty's Bavarian Artillery Regiment, in 1904 he was promoted to lieutenant. In 1914 he graduated from the Bavarian Military Academy.

World War II. Reboot 325

To page 120

Ehrenburg Ilya Girshevich (Grigorievich) (1891-1967) - publicist and public figure, twice winner of the Stalin Prize (1942, 1948). The son of a merchant of the 2nd guild. He studied at the gymnasium together with N.I. Bukharin. In 1905 he joined the Bolsheviks. In January 1908, Gola was arrested and released pending trial, and in December 1908, "because of his ill condition," he went abroad. He lived in France, where in 1910 he published the collection "Poems". In 1914-1917 he was a correspondent for Russian bourgeois newspapers on the Western Front. In March 1917 he returned to Russia. He reacted negatively to the coming to power of the Bolsheviks and in 1921 he again left for France. From 1921 he lived in Paris, was close to the left circles of French society, actively collaborated in the Soviet press. Since 1923 he has been a correspondent for Izvestia. He became an integral part of the Soviet establishment, a living confirmation of the "freedom of creativity" in the USSR. During the Great Patriotic War, a war correspondent for the Krasnaya Zvezda newspaper, about 3 thousand of his articles were published in newspapers in 1941-1945. Author of the slogan "Kill the German". He was a member of the commission for the "investigation" of the murders of Polish officers in Katyn, confirmed that these executions were committed by the Germans. He was included in the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee, after its dissolution in 1949 he did not suffer. In 1950 he was elected to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. Since 1950 Vice-President of the World Peace Council. In 1952 he received

Lenin Prize "For Strengthening Peace Between Nations" Always remained loyal to Stalinism. After the death of I.V. Stalin changed his previous point of view. In 1954-1956 he wrote the story "The Thaw", which caused a lot of controversy in society. It was by its name that they began to call a short period of indulgence at the beginning of the reign of N.S. Khrushchev. Ehrenburg later stated that under Stalin "he survived by pure chance."

326 | Igor Shumeiko

To page 147

Henlein, Konrad Henlein (1898-1945) - German politician of the Sudetenland in Czechoslovakia. Born May 6, 1898 in Maffersdorf (now Vratislavice) in Bohemia, the son of a German and a Czech. He was a bank clerk, then a gymnastics teacher. In 1931 he headed the German Gymnastics Association in Czechoslovakia. On October 1, 1933, Henlein established a small political party, the German Patriotic Front, which demanded autonomy for the Sudetenland within the framework of the Czechoslovak state. Henlein proposed the formation of a federal state similar to the system of Swiss cantons, which gave ethnic minorities independence without undermining national unity. However, Henlein's party was organized according to the principle of the Fuhrer. In October 1934, she held her first mass rally, attended by 20,000 people. In 1935, having already gathered a significant number of adherents, the German Patriotic Front changed its name and became the Sudeten German Party (SDP). Since 1936, the SDP has already functioned as a "fifth column" in Czechoslovakia, receiving powerful financial support through the "Volksdeutsche Mittelyitelle". For example, back in 1933 Henlein's party newspaper received 120,000 Czech crowns from Germany to pay off debts. In the same year, Rudolf Hess granted a one-time grant of 8 million crowns. Henlein himself received 12,000 Reichsmarks a month. Supporters of Henlein, temporarily hiding under the sign "Shport Abteilung" (the first letters coincided with the abbreviation SA), launched an agitation for granting independence to the Suletian Germans.

In the 1935 elections, the SDP won 44 mandates or 60% of the seats of the German-speaking population of Czechoslovakia. On March 28, 1938, Hitler assured Henlein: "I will support you. Tomorrow you will become my governor (51e 54 aishw)

World War II. Reboot ||

togrep tet Z"a (rayeg) "A month later, Henlein put forward 8 T. n. "Carlsbad demands", in fact demanding complete autonomy for the Sudeten Germans. In May he went to London, where he swore that he had never received orders or even recommendations from Berlin. After the Munich Agreement of 1938, Henlein was appointed Reichskommissar for the Sulet region. | May 1939 he became Gauleiter and Reichsstatthalter and headed the civil administration in Czechoslovakia. In May 1945, he was taken prisoner by the American 7th Army and committed suicide in a displaced persons camp on May 10, 1945.

To page 160

Leon Degrel (1906-1994) - leader of the Belgian Nazis, one of the commanders of the SS troops, SS Obersturmbannführer (01/01/1945). The son of a Catholic priest, a member of the Jesuit order. Received a legal education. In the 20s. joined the Walloon nationalist organization Action Française, a supporter of firm power, an anti-Semite. Founded a small publishing company. In 1930, he organized the fascist organization of Rexists "Rex" (Veh). by analogy with the Italian Fascist Party; before the war he received large subsidies from Italy. I took the NSDAP as a model for myself — in symbolism, ideology, etc.

In the 1935 elections, his party won 21 seats in parliament. In February 1937, he lost the elections without gaining the support of voters, and the party actually ceased to exist. On May 10, 1940, he was arrested by the Belgian authorities as a German accomplice. The Rexist movement revived in 1940 after the occupation of Belgium by German troops. In 1941

Degrel volunteered for the Walloon Legion of the SS and took part in the battles on the Soviet German front. In June 1943 he was transferred to the SS troops with the rank of Obersturmführer.

Igor Shumeiko

Führer of the Reserve, from February 1944 commander of the 5th SS Volunteer Assault Brigade "Wallonia", which was deployed into a division. He was awarded the Knight's Cross of the Iron Cross and received oak branches for it. At the end of 1944, under the leadership of Degrel, the Flemish-Wallon Committee was formed, and Degrel himself was proclaimed the regional Führer of the Walloon people. After the defeat of Germany in 1945, he fled to Spain. In Belgium, he was sentenced to death in absentia. In 1946 he moved to Argentina and then returned to Spain. In 1954, he received Spanish citizenship and changed his name to Leon José de Ramirez Ren. In 1973, Belgian journalists recorded an interview with him in Madrid, and D. said: "I regret that I did not manage to achieve what was planned, but if I had a chance, I would repeat everything all over again." Author of memoirs (1992). Died in San Antonio Hospital.

To page 180

Walter von Brauchitsch (1881-1948) - Field Marshal of the Nazi Army (1940). Born October 4, 1881 in Berlin in the family of an officer. In the army since 1900. Member of the 1st World War in staff positions, then served in the Reichswehr. In 1931, he received the rank of lieutenant general and commanded an artillery unit. From 1932 he was the inspector general of artillery, from 1933 he commanded the 1st military district in Königsberg, from 1935 the 1st army corps. Since 1937, the commander of the 4th Army Group. On February 4, 1938, after the removal of General Fritsch, he was appointed commander-in-chief of the ground forces. Brauchitsch participated in the development and implementation of war plans against Poland, France, Yugoslavia, Greece and the Soviet Union. After the first successes of Hitler, he cringed more and more to the Führer. The almost bloodless victory over France crossed out the last hopes of the conspirators.

World War II. Reboot 329

kov that he will take the side of the opposition. By this time, Brauchitsch was already automatically following Hitler's orders, even contrary to his own opinion. After the failure of the attack on Moscow, he was transferred to the reserve on December 19, 1941, according to the official version, for health reasons. From now on, the name of Brauchitsch was tarnished. Hearing of the failure of the July 1944 Plot, he publicly denounced the plot. In 1945, he surrendered to the British. Brauchitsch died in a prisoner-of-war hospital in Hamburg on October 18, 1948.

To page 182

Lothar Rendulich (1887-1971) - military commander of Nazi Germany during the Second World War, Colonel General,

To page 187

Hans Bepnd Gisevius (1904-1974) was a German diplomat and liquor. Born 14 July 1904 in Arnsberg. Having entered the diplomatic service with the rise of the Nazis to power in 1933, Gisevius held various posts in the Foreign Office. He was involved in several conspiracies against Hitler. From 1940 to 1944, Gisevius was vice consul in Zurich, and in that capacity he met frequently with Allen Dulles, a representative of the American intelligence agencies. After the failure of the July Plot in 1944, Gisevius remained in Switzerland. He was one of the main witnesses for the prosecution at the Nuremberg Trials. After the war, he spent several years in the United States and in West Berlin, but then returned to Switzerland, where he settled. He died in West Germany on February 23, 1974.

In his memoirs, Gisevius describes the leading figures of the Third Reich and attempts to eliminate Hitler. He was frightened by the immorality of the Nazi regime, especially by the events

"Kristallnacht" - Jewish

550 Igor Shumeiko

thunders. He notes that the word "pogrom" is not enough to describe what happened in Germany: "Not a single Jewish home was left untouched, not a single Jewish business was left looted, not a single synagogue was left unset on fire." Gisevius reported that anyone who lived through those terrible hours would never forget them: "The mob, incited to madness, poured out its emotions on defenseless people ... The frightened middle class stared at the Nazi monster like a rabbit at a boa constrictor." According to Gisevius, despite the fact that the orders to carry out the pogroms came from Heinrich Himmler and Reinhard Heydrich, "the Führer personally was responsible for these terrible and revealing

ominous incidents."

To page 189

Ante Pavelić (1889–1959) was a Croatian fascist politician, leader of the Ustaše movement and leader of the puppet regime of the Independent State of Croatia during World War II. Ante Pavelić left the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in 1929 to fight the royal dictatorship from abroad. Settling in Italy, he led the Ustashe movement and its violent actions in Yugoslavia. One of the most notorious acts of terrorism carried out by the Ustaše was the assassination of King Alexander [and French Foreign Minister Louis Barthou in Marseille on October 9, 1934. Being supported by Mussolini, after the capitulation of Yugoslavia on April 17, 1941, Pavelic became the head of the Independent State of Croatia, created by Hitler and Mussolini, proclaiming himself the head (leader). The Ustaše-ruled state covered two-fifths of the territory of the former Yugoslavia and about a third of its population were Serbs. Pavelić was the initiator of the publication of racial laws, on the basis of which the systematic genocide of Serbs, Jews and Gypsies began. The largest of

World War II. Reboot 331

Croatian concentration camps included a camp in Jasenovac, where, according to the Simon Wiesenthal Center, about 600,000 people died. Deportations to Auschwitz were also organized. In 1945, Pavelić fled to Argentina, taking with him part of the state treasury. In Argentina, he established a government-in-exile, while in Yugoslavia he was sentenced to death in absentia. Pavelić worked as a security adviser to the Argentine dictator Juan Perón. In 1957, an assassination attempt was made on him by the Yugoslav secret services, as a result of which he was wounded and from the consequences of which he died two years later.

To page 236

Werner von Fritsch (1880-1939) - Colonel General, Commander-in-Chief of the German Land Forces in 1935-1938. Born August 4, 1880 in Benrath. At the age of 18, he joined the army, having shown high qualities, he attracted the attention of senior officers of the General Staff. In 1901, when Fritsch was only 21 years old, he was invited to the Military Academy. In 1911, with the rank of 1st lieutenant, he was appointed to a responsible post in the General Staff. During the Weimar Republic he served in the Reichswehr. Like his colleague Werner von Blomberg, Fritsch was a staunch supporter of good neighborly relations with Soviet Russia. Calm, patient, conscious of his duty, Fritsch was only interested in military service. He had little contact with women and was never married. In 1930 he commanded a cavalry division in Frankfurt an der Oder and became one of the leading officers of the General Staff. In July 1932, Fritsch was promoted to the rank of lieutenant general.

The coming of the Nazis to power, the lawlessness of Hitler's associates, the suppression of civil liberties in the country had a strong impact on Fritsch, but he still refrained from open criticism of the regime. What disturbed him most of all was that the anti-Bolshevik

352 Igor Shumeiko

Lera could lead to an unwanted war with the Soviet Union. In 1934, Fritsch was appointed commander of the ground forces, and in 1935, commander in chief. Together with von Blomberg, he participated in the creation of the new German armed forces - the Wehrmacht. On November 5, 1937, Fritsch attended the Hossbach Conference at which Hitler laid out his aggressive intentions.

Fritsch was shocked by Hitler's plans to start a war at a time when the army was not ready for it. Hitler did not forgive him for dissent. After being fabricated by Göring and Himmler for being homosexual, Fritsch was forced to resign on February 4, 1938. His place was taken by General Walther von Brauchitsch. The officers' court of honor completely acquitted Fritsch, he was again drafted into the army on the eve of World War II. Fritsch was killed in action near Warsaw on September 22, 1939. Eyewitnesses claimed that Colonel General Fritsch specifically sought death on the battlefield.

To page 286

Anatoly Ivanovich Utkin is a historian, specialist in international relations, and a recognized expert on US foreign policy. A special area of scientific interests is the US regional policy, in particular in Europe; history of the Cold War. Works at the Institute of the USA and Canadian Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Since 1994, he has been a professor at the IPPK at Moscow State University, then, since 1997. — Director of the Center for International Studies of the Institute for the USA and Canada of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Author of 21 monographs, chapters in collective works, published more than 150 articles in leading journals and periodicals in several languages, as well as analytical works, reviews, and reference books. He taught at the Bosphorus Institute (Istanbul. 1991-1993), at Ecole Normal Superior (Paris, 1993-1994). at Columbia University (New York, 1998). Advisor to the Committee on International Affairs of the State Duma.

World War II. Reboot 133

To page 295

Ernest Bevin (1881-1951), British trade union leader and statesman. Born March 9, 1881 in Winsford, Somerset. His father and mother died when the boy was not even seven years old. Bevin left school at the age of 11 and worked on a farm. In 1894 he moved to Bristol, where he worked as a truck driver. Later he became a Baptist preacher. By 1914 he was one of the three leading organizers of the national trade union movement. In 1918 he ran for Parliament from the Labor Party. In 1921, he initiated the unification of trade unions of transport workers and the creation of a national trade union of unskilled and municipal workers. As general secretary of the union, Bevin did not object to the defeated general strike of 1926, although he considered it insufficiently prepared. In 1930, Bevin became a member of the Macmillan Commission on the National Financial and Banking System, and in 1938 took an active part in consultations with the government on questions of rearmament.

For a number of years on the eve of World War II, Bevin opposed the pacifists in the ranks of the Labor Party, and in 1935 he secured the resignation of their leader in parliament, J. Lansbury. Bevin was an opponent of the Munich Agreement and a supporter of the armament of Great Britain. Shortly after the outbreak of World War II, Bevin was elected to Parliament and became Minister of Labor in the coalition government of W. Churchill.

After the war, Bevin resigned from his post to take part in the 1945 elections. He became Foreign Minister in the Labor government of C. Attlee and together with the latter participated in the Berlin Conference of the leaders of the three powers. He was a supporter of the preservation of the British Empire and an aggressive and tough foreign policy. In an effort to prevent Soviet expansion

Igor Shumeiko

to Europe during the unfolding of the Cold War, Bevin worked closely with the United States and supported the Marshall Plan to rebuild the war-torn economies of Europe. He took an active part in the creation of the Western European Union (Brussels Pact of 1948) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949. His proposal to turn Palestine into a federal state of Jews and Arabs was rejected by both Jews and Arabs. = Bevin died in London on April 14, 1951.

To page 308

General Kazimierz Sosnkowski - from August 10, 1920, the Polish Minister of War.

General Władysław Anders formed the Polish Army "Anders Army" in 1941-1943 on the territory of the USSR by agreement with the Polish government in exile from prisoners of war and interned as a result of the Soviet-Polish war of 1939, Polish citizens. In August 1942, the Anders Army was withdrawn to Iran.

Lev Anninsky

WAIT FOR THE BABY, DEVIL?

I don't mean those proverbial devils, any of whom are eager to contact an infant. And not the baby, which, to the delight of all the devils, shouted that the king was naked. I mean the historian Igor Shumeiko, who in his book "World War II. Reloaded" retaliated (rather with the sarcasm of a pamphleteer than with the equanimity of a scholar):

"...This is, in fact, the advantage of a one-year-old baby over an old man..."

The old people who remember the Great War are held captive by their memory. They are dying. Babies, free from such a memory, grow up. They can twist the past however they want.

What to expect from a historian who was a one-year-old baby, when the Power, freed from the grave fear of the deceased Supreme Commander-in-Chief, began to slide off to nowhere, but it became clear when the babies entered adulthood and inherited not the Power, but broken pieces of it. And instead of the Victory - a list of claims from small peoples who suffered during the Great War.

By model:

- You, Russians, of course, drove out the Nazis, but you hurt the local residents, if you please.
apologize and pay

Lev Anninsky

for broken pots. Do not expect citizenship in the newly independent states! You are now in the minority!

As expected, the American president stands up to protect the rights of the Russian minority: he does not forgive Hitler for infringement of minorities.

The former baby, a dozen years too late to be born to the Victory, picks up with insidious humor: what, the meaning of the Great War and Victory is the worldwide assertion of the rights of minorities? Andersen's child would appreciate such a joke: today's globalists see the world as a herd of communities (countries, nations, confessions) that must be shepherd; the opponents of globalism are ready to save such a motley world of minorities from the world shepherds.

But then you can't remember the Great War by anything else, except for belated accounts. Everyone is small, and everyone is crippled, but who was gutted there first - who can remember? Americans, for example (true "babies" of New History), when asked who fought in the Second

world war, sometimes it takes a long time to figure out on whose side Hitler was. And we remember this guest well, but for us, too, he gradually merges with Napoleon and other adversaries of the fatherland. What to do: and Guderian's tanks in the mists of time will eventually become something like Hannibal's elephants.

So: against this background, the study of the young historian Igor Shumeiko is striking in its thorough, scrupulous knowledge of the facts of the war, which he did not find. And in general the facts of history. Figuratively speaking, from Horace to Grotius - if about more times. And if it's about recent history, then in the full breadth of impenetrable rubble, because "so much has been said and written that if a middle-aged person now decides to give up everything and will only study memoirs and dissertations on this topic, he will be provided with reading on two lives ahead.

Yes. If you read the way a ram reads the inscriptions on the new gates. If you read. Knowing why you are reading

,>

"Wait for the baby, devils? 357

to understand something in one life, in the "middle age" of which Igor now resides. Shumeiko. Although the facts themselves are stubbornly interesting things. For example, Churchill's famous speech at Fulton (the full text of which, in a fresh translation from English, is provided by Shumeiko for the first time in our press). Or a document with a different aim, one of those that were first hammered into our consciousness and then swept away with a new broom (Stalin's answers to Pravda's questions about Churchill's speech).

Some facts are seen in an unusual for us perspective. For example. the number of tanks made at Czech factories and reached Stalingrad... If I had known, I would have been found. what to answer in 1988 to the Czech exiles who demanded an answer from me why Soviet tanks reached Prague in 1968.

Some facts, in general, seem to have been introduced into our journalistic circulation for the first time. For example, the battle of 1940 at Mers-el-Kebira, when the British sent the French fleet (along with sailors) to the bottom, so that these ships would not be captured by the Germans who defeated the French. If I had known, I would have found something to answer to the Balts who were separating from us, whose independence was lowered to the bottom by the Red Army in the same 1940, so that their territory would not fall to the Nazis.

However, Igor Shumeiko himself would be appropriate to ask tricky questions to his opponents, in which double standards are turned inside out and back on their face. and lino it appears in "primordial". You need to be able to do this, and the author of the book "World War II. Reboot" can do it. He is bright, biting, resourceful. The talent of the polemist here is so obvious (and so seductive) that the author sometimes gives himself over to temptation, and then, drawn into the exchange of jabs, manages to whisper to serious readers that this is, of course. pamphlet. and he, Shumeiko, understands this.

5-5 Lev Anninsky

Pamphlet poison — from the need to translate the realities of the Great War into the language of the modern world — the world of minorities, buzzing with the demands of political correctness.

Smarties - another portion of poison:

"...Perhaps Stalin. would it really be worth somehow organizing a communication session and consulting with Havel, Landsbergis, Clinton and Madeleine Albright: how should the Great War be waged?

To force Vaclav Havel (who lost his hereditary factories in the Czech Republic) or Madeleine Albright (a girl who survived the invasion of the Germans in the same Czech Republic, and then the Russians), or Landsbergis (who, for the sake of politics, had to digress from research on žiurlionis) - and even more so

Clinton - to answer for the fact that they feel sorry for those who 60 years ago came under the arm - this is, of course, a purely literary move on the part of Shumeiko: none of them will react to such promptings. But Rezun and Bukovsky, perhaps, will answer, and in the same pamphlet style, and then the exchange of rudeness will continue, during which those cardinal ideas that Shumeiko proposes to comprehend may be buried.

While paying tribute to the informative density and stylistic brilliance of his book, I still think that the main thing in it is precisely the proposed ideas.

The first idea: to take a fresh look at the European map of 1941. where "everything is literally smeared with brown paint", and therefore to distinguish in this those who entered into an alliance with Germany (Italy, Finland, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria), those who were captured (France, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Greece...). And inside the occupied Europe — "the Poles fought, leave the Germans ruins, the Czechs handed over themselves intact..." "ready" so that nothing Slavic remains). You can make a comparative table according to the degree

"Wait for the baby, devils?

resistance to Hitler... and then, contrary to all ethnic dispositions, the main anti-fascists will be... the Germans themselves! Of course. the pro-Bolshevik "Red Capella" and the pro-general "Black Capella" are diametrical in terms of long-range targets, but in terms of damage. inflicted on Hitler, they stand side by side: there is Goering's confession (at the Nuremberg trials) that the "Red Chapel" cost Germany the loss of ten divisions; and there is Churchill's admission (in his memoirs) that Czechoslovakia's refusal to resist cost the Allies the loss of a tridpati of five divisions. Pretty comparable numbers...

"The Norwegians resisted much longer, but they were helped by the landscape of the country, and the English landings, and the fleet. The Dutch are closer to the Danish version. Belgians are closer to Norwegian. Luxembourg - two wounded (probably someone slipped).

I leave the last assumption on the conscience of not a historian, but a pamphleteer... and the historian's idea of drawing a map of interwar Europe in a new way is as striking in its unexpected insight as the cry of Andersen's child. Isn't some unknown, previously hidden structure of reality exposed here?

And if you superimpose the map of 1941 on the map of 1914? There is the Entente, here ... also the Entente?

And if you superimpose a map of 1941 (Hitler's Europe) on a map of 1991? The same Europe will work out, only the capital was moved from Berlin to Brussels.

And again, through a sarcastic grin, you catch a sharp look, and reality emerges from under the usual clothes (including those from Marxist textbooks): there is an "imperialist bloc", here, too, a "revanchist" bloc, and there and here the people, united by language and ethnic origin, subject to the pressure of different blocs, breaks down to the nearest micron into the same warring parts: with each new shake-up, Croats and Serbs are enemies. con

340 Lev Anninsky

the professional discrepancy between Catholicism and Orthodoxy, but only Catholic Poles lay down their bones fighting against Hitler, and Orthodox Romanians recruited him to the Russian front no, but soldiers. Where is the logic?

There is no logic. Neither in social, nor in confessional schemes. There is a mysterious, not yet understood reality under all these schemes. Talk about the form of government and about different ideals (democracy, communism, the proletariat, the bourgeoisie) is all, as Shumeiko writes, "smoking

veil", but the essence is that in these different systems (blocks) in 1914, in 1941, and in 1991 all the same people live. That is, peoples.

It is they who decide where the country (system) will fall in the next split of the continent. And how long will the country resist (if any). Sometimes neighboring (or even kindred) peoples find themselves on different sides of the next demarcation. Georgian?

No, indeed, these new dividing lines defy any conventional logic. If we count the world as a bunch of small peoples (inescapable "minorities" in relation to the mass of humanity), only accidentally falling (and forcibly driven) into blocs, systems, empires and commonwealths.

If, however, these associations are recognized as the same ethnopolitical, geopolitical and psychopolitical reality as the "heap" in which they must seek support, then the lines of tension between systems should be considered the basic law of being.

And where there are big conglomerates (armies, unions, coalitions, etc.) there, alas, there are big wars.

By introducing into the equation the category of the Great War. Igor Shumeiko not only translates World War II (and ours,

"Wait for the baby, devils? 31

Great Patriotic War) from the language of the current millennium (with current bills for the occupation and other inconveniences of wartime) to the language of wartime. In fact, he offers a new starting point - one that was not in the schemes of 1941.

World War. then it was derived from the theories of imperialism, colonialism, from certain "stages" of this or that "system", from the readiness of communism to finally bury capitalism with its wars... It was not for nothing that the Soviet people rose in 1941 Hitlerism, being sure. that the war is the last.

Tell them then that there will be no "last" ...

To say something equally hopeless to their fathers, who sang: "This is our last..."

But now you have to say "something the same." Andersen's baby voice. Almost at random, groping, blindly, almost with despair, admitting that there is something in the very foundation of being, under all political correctness and political aggressiveness — somewhere where Tyutchev heard the stir of chaos — something that at any unexpected moment, fire, storm, horror can break out on the surface of historical action, overturning all restraints at once.

The Big War is something that dictates its own rules. Or no rules. Something that lives by its own laws. And killing. Something that cannot be commanded, for the War itself commands everything. This is by no means a "continuation of politics by other means"—it is an annulment of all former politics. This does not fit into the concept of justice - injustice. This only fits into Tolstoy's dilemma: War is either Absurd or People's. That is, a nailing club. But even a cudgel from the point of view of peaceful logic is quite an absurdity.

Realizing what kind of monster he is letting into the wilds and labyrinths of History, Igor Shumeiko warns that

En Lev Anninsky

Bolnaya Voyna is the "main term" of his book, that this concept was introduced "semi-intuitively", and the only thing that can be done with giant dumps of "indigestible" facts is to try to reload them into a new coordinate system.

This RELOAD, of course, requires, in addition to knowledge of "indigestible" facts (which I have already mentioned to Shumeiko), a desperate (and purely artistic) imagination. Much more impressive than pamphlet shine.

Therefore, in conclusion, I want to recall a fragment from the book by Igor Shumeiko, where he presents the consequences of the Munich "appeasement" of Hitler in the form of ... a beer metaphor. The one, where the "comrade" twists the big man, the pan and monsieur, who has already got hold of money and weapons, and then begins to make excuses. "mumbling about socialism..."

I will comment on the picture (quite, however, clear).

Who is this hardened and embittered comrade, mumbling something "about socialism", we understand. And who the pan is is also clear: this is a Czech, whose country the thug-Hitler is about to slash and capture. And who monsieur is understandable.

Where, excuse me, my lord? He was also sitting there! Where did he go with the purse and the revolver? After all, in Munich, not only Daladier decided the fate of Europe, but also Chamberlain. Who believed that by giving Czechoslovakia to Hitler, he was buying Europe peace.

Chamberlain believed something, but only Churchill believed otherwise. The Great War, already hanging in the air, was canceling all the previous rules of the game, and it was Churchill who felt this. It was he, the fierce enemy of the Soviet Union before the War (and immediately after the War, too, starting with the Fulton speech), who in 1940 declared to Hitler the same war to the death that Hitler had declared to Stalin in 1941.

Interesting geography: of all the major European nations, only the British immediately decided on the Great War without rules: and that is why, without waiting until

"Wait for the baby, devils? Hey

Pétain will hand over the fleet to the Germans - the British began to sink this French fleet. Yes, it was the same violation of the rules (and purely human meanness) as the capture of the Baltic States by the Red Army. What was to be done? The British needed for the War a sea free from the Germans, and for the War we needed a coast free from the Germans. That is the territory of the Baltic States. We should have postponed the deadly fight, moved as far as possible the future front line. And without Latvian sour cream and without Estonian slates, we would have managed somehow. Now we get along quite well.

Returning to the current sovereign accounts (to the rules of normal life, that is, to relations free from military expediency = human meanness), I will say this. From the Soviet power, the Balts nevertheless received the status of union republics (which they used when separating from the disintegrating Union). And what would they have received from the Germans if they had been part of the Third Reich during the Great War - this is a big subjunctive question. I'm afraid Igor Shumeiko is right when he assumes that for Messrs. Rosenberg and Ribbentrop all this "hoarding" was not the same "only Europe" as for us (Peter cut a window there for us, and the Soviet Union inherited it), but hereditary, since Baltic times, a servant under the German barons.

Therefore, in Shumeikov's pub-picture, the very "Baltic spectator" who sits aside on his chair, hoping to wait out the fight, and is very offended when a comrade pulls this sovereign chair out from under him in order to crack it, is completely legitimate. on the head of the herr-aggressor.

It remains for me to comment on the final touch in the picture.

"For some reason, there is no way out of this strange bar."

This is in the situation of 1938 - no. And half a century later? What happened there half a century later?
People gathered in Helsinki

En Lev Anninsky

Freeze the results of the Great War... And then it flared up in Afghanistan, on the other side of the Earth from Helsinki.

The Europeans, who washed themselves with blood in two world wars, stood up on their ears to prevent a new battle of monsters on their continent. Had such a horror happened for the third time, the strategic map of 1914 (aka the map of 1941) would again stretch from Vichy to the Volga, to the Caucasus, to the Urals.

And what if from the other side: because of the Volga, the Urals and the Caucasus, such a force will trample on that will generally change the contours of future history? In addition to Hitler and Napoleon, Attila, and Genghis, and Timur walked here ... What strategic cards will then have to be laid out on the table, what paint to cover it all with, what demons to drive back into bottles?

Who will drive?

Like who? The current one-year-old babies who have grown up will see all these devils.

Literary and artistic publication Empire. KC

Shumeiko Igor Nikolaevich

WORLD SECOND. REBOOT

General Director L.L. Palko Responsible for the issue V.P. Yelensky Editor-in-Chief S.N. Dmitriev Editor V.N. Ilyin
Corrector E.Yu. Taskon Design by D. V. Grushin Layout by M. G. Khabibullov

Veche 2000 Publishing House LLC Veche Publishing House LLC Veche Publishing House LLC

129348. Moscow, st. Red Pine. 24.

Hygienic certificate No. 77.99.02.953.D.008287.12.05 dated 08.12.2003. E-ta: hesve@uesVe. gi vir: // mmuchimesKe.gi

Signed for publication 20 11.2006. Format 84x108 1/32. Headset "Kudryashov". Offset printing. Offset paper.
Pech. I. 11. Circulation 3,000 copies. Order No. 4675

Printed in full accordance with the quality of the provided transparencies at Tula Printing House OJSC 300600, Tula, Lenin Ave., 109.

RELOAD Igor SHUMEYKO

How did the author manage to arouse genuine interest in events that have been traveled many times and comprehensively described in tons of historical literature? The essence - in a new perspective,

in a new assessment of their significance for

course and outcome of the war. The author, penetrating inside the event, pulls out its essence, hidden under historical dust, and presents to the reader: here, look, comprehend!

Colonel General L.G. IVASHOV, Vice-President of the Academy of Geopolitical Problems

...there is something in the very substratum of being. under all political correctness and political aggressiveness—somewhere where Tyutchev heard the stir of chaos—something that at any unexpected moment can break through with fire, storm, horror to the surface of historical action. overturning all restraints at once.

Lev ANNINSKY, critic

Shumeiko Igor Nikolaevich was born in 1957. Cybernetician by education, specialist

in the field of foreign trade, public relations.

Since the 1980s, he has published poems, stories, and essays in the magazines Druzhba, Yunost, Literaturnaya Gazeta, and abroad. In 1994, his novel Bartimaeus the Eyewitness was published (radio show in 1995

on Radio Russia). In the new millennium, he is a regular contributor to The Independent. "Literaturnaya", "Novaya" newspapers, as well as many magazines.

His famous essay

in Nezavisimaya Gazeta, "Adolf Hitler as Trustee of CJSK Europe" became one of the starting points of THIS BOOK.